JOHN BULL.

"FOR GOD, THE SOVEREIGN, AND THE PEOPLE!"

Registered at the General Post Office as a Newspaper.

VOL. LXII.
No. 3,229.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1882.

WITH A SUPPLEMENT.

PRICE 5d.
By Post 5½d.

Albemarle Street,
October, 1882.

MR. MURRAY'S
LIST OF RECENT WORKS.

THE SPEAKER'S COMMENTARY ON THE BIBLE. Explanatory and Critical, with a Revision of the Translation. By the BISHOPS and CLERGY of the ANGLICAN CHURCH. Edited by F. C. COOK, M.A., Canon of Exeter. Complete in 10 vols. Royal 8vo.

"There can be no question that the Speaker's Commentary will supersede all other commentaries for English readers, so far as an external commentary is concerned."—Guardian.

MEN AND EVENTS OF MY TIME IN INDIA. 1847 to 1880. By SIR RICHARD TEMPLE, Bart., Author of "India in 1880." 8vo. 16s.

A JOURNEY TO THE WHITE SEA, AND THE KOLA PENINSULA. By EDWARD RAE, Author of "The Country of the Moors." Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 15s.

LAND OF THE MIDNIGHT SUN. Summer and Winter Journeys through Sweden, Norway, Lapland, and Northern Finland. By P. B. DU CHAILLU. Map and 235 Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo. 36s.

A NATURALIST'S JOURNAL IN BORNEO AND THE SULU ARCHIPELAGO. By F. W. BURBIDGE. Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 14s.

THE ODYSSEY OF HOMER rendered into English Verse. Vol. II. Books XIII.–XXIV. By GEN. SCHOMBERG, C.B. 8vo. 12s.

LETTERS AND JOURNALS OF SIR WILLIAM GOMM. The Helder Expedition—Copenhagen—The Walcheren Expedition—The Peninsula—Waterloo, &c. 1799—1815. Edited by F. C. CARR GOMM. Portraits. 8vo. 12s.

ELWIN'S AND COURTHOPE'S EDITION OF POPE'S WORKS. VOLUME III. of the POETRY. Containing the Satires, Moral Essays, &c. Edited, with Notes and Introductions, by W. J. COURTHOPE. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE BEDOUINS of the EUPHRATES VALLEY. By LADY ANNE BLUNT. With some account of the Arabs and their Horses. Illustrations. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 24s.

A PILGRIMAGE TO NEJD, the Cradle of the Arab Race, and a Visit to the Court of the Arab Emir. By LADY ANNE BLUNT. Illustrations. 2 vols. Post 8vo. 24s.

TRAVELS OF A LADY IN THE INTERIOR OF JAPAN, including Visits to the Aborigines of Yezo and the Shrines of Nikko and Isé. By ISABELLA BIRD. Illustrations. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 24s.

LIFE AND WORKS OF ALBERT DÜRER. By MORIZ THAUSING. Edited by F. A. EATON, M.A., Secretary of the Royal Academy. Illustrations. 2 vols. Medium 8vo. 42s.

LIFE AND WORKS OF MICHAEL ANGELO. Including Inedited Documents from the Buonarotti Archives. By C. HEATH WILSON. Illustrations. 8vo. 15s.

LIFE, WORKS, AND TIMES OF TITIAN. With some Account of his Family. By J. A. CROWE and G. B. CAVALCASELLE. Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

SIX MONTHS IN ASCENSION. By MRS. GILL. With A History of the Methods Employed to Discover the Sun's Distance from the Earth. By DAVID GILL. Map. Crown 8vo. 9s.

HANDBOOK FOR BENGAL AND BRITISH BURMAH, N.-W. Provinces, Calcutta, Gaya, Benares, Allahabad, Cawnpore, Lucknow, Agra, Gwalior, Delhi, Naini Tal, Khatmandu, Darjiling, Rangoon, Mandalay, &c. By E. B. EASTWICK. Maps. Post 8vo. 20s.

THE CRUISE OF THE "ROB ROY" ON THE NILE, Red Sea, The Jordan, Gennesareth, and the Waters of Damascus. By JOHN MACGREGOR, M.A. Illustrations. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

TRAVELS in the HIGHLANDS of TURKEY, ALBANIA, MONTENEGRO, AND THESSALY. By Rev. H. F. TOZER. Illustrations. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 24s.

ABYSSINIA and THE CRADLE of the BLUE NILE. With A Visit to King John of Ethiopia. By E. A. DE COSSON. Illustrations. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 21s.

THE STUDENT'S HISTORY of the ENGLISH CHURCH. From the Planting of the Church in Britain to the Accession of Henry VIII. By G. G. PERRY, M.A., Canon of Lincoln. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle Street.

NOW READY.

CANON FARRAR'S NEW WORK.

THE EARLY DAYS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Price 24s.

CASSELL, PETTER, GALPIN, AND CO., LUDGATE HILL, LONDON.

☞ COMMENCEMENT OF THE NEW QUIVER VOLUME.

On OCT. 25, 1882, will be published the

FIRST PART (price 6d.) of the NEW VOLUME
OF

THE QUIVER.

Being the NOVEMBER PART.

The Editor of "The Quiver" in an Address to his Readers says:—

"IN thus happily inaugurating the **22nd Year** of the publication of The Quiver, the Proprietors cannot but express their deep thankfulness that such abundant success continues to attend the efforts of the Editor to provide bright, pure, and attractive Sunday Reading for the Christian Household.

"For Twenty-one Years The Quiver has helped to stem the flood of pernicious literature let loose upon young and old, and has proved a powerful antidote to its baneful influence. In this long and painstaking endeavour the Editor has succeeded almost beyond calculation; and he earnestly trusts and believes that his continued efforts in the same direction will have the good-will and active co-operation of all Christian readers, whether as individuals, or as members and supporters of Associations for the advancement of every form of religious life and work."

N.B.—The Quiver Yearly Volume for 1882 *is complete with the October Monthly Part, and is now ready, price 7s. 6d. This Volume, with its 764 PAGES of highly illustrated letterpress, contains a most valuable collection of Works by our leading Divines, forming in fact a PERFECT LIBRARY OF SOUND AND VARIED READING for every Member of the Family.*

CASSELL, PETTER, GALPIN, AND CO., LUDGATE HILL, LONDON.

BEMROSE AND SONS' LIST.

CHURCH CONGRESS, 1882.—Official Report.—The Authorised REPORT of the CONGRESS will contain the Sermons and the Papers in full, and Reports of all the Speeches. An efficient Staff of Parliamentary Reporters has been engaged, and the Speeches will be revised by the Speakers. Arrangements are made for the issue of the Volume on December 21st, at the latest.

To prevent disappointment, orders should be given forthwith, as the number printed will be regulated by the number of Subscribers, and the price will be raised after publication.

Price to Subscribers—The Report, in paper cover, 6s. 6d., post free, 7s.; in cloth, 7s. 6d., post free, 8s.; and in half-calf, antique, 10s., post free, 10s. 6d. After the day of publication the price will be 10s. 6d. in cloth.

The Report will be supplied at Subscription Price by the Publishers only (Bemrose and Sons, 23, Old Bailey, London; and Derby), to whom all Names and Addresses should be sent direct.

CONCORDANCE TO THE REVISED VERSION.

Just published. Fcap. 4to. cloth, price 7s. 6d.

THE STUDENT'S CONCORDANCE to the REVISED VERSION, 1881, of the NEW TESTAMENT of OUR LORD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST. Compiled upon an original plan, showing the changes in all words referred to. With Appendices of the chief Authorised Words and Passages omitted in the Revision, and of New and Disused Words: A Table of the Genealogy of the English New Testament, &c.

HELLER'S ANNOTATED EDITION OF THE CODE.

Just published. Demy 8vo, price 1s.

THE NEW CODE of MINUTES of the EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, INSTRUCTIONS to INSPECTORS (1882), and Official Forms and Documents, with Explanatory Notes and a Copious Index. By THOMAS EDMUND HELLER, Secretary National Union of Elementary Teachers, and Member of the School Board for London.

COMMENCEMENT OF NEW VOLUME.

AUNT JUDY'S MAGAZINE FOR YOUNG PEOPLE.

6d. MONTHLY.

The New Volume, beginning with the November Part, will contain:—

A COLOURED FRONTISPIECE, by Richard André, to a Tale entitled "SUNFLOWERS AND A RUSHLIGHT," by Juliana H. Ewing.
A Paper on DARTMOOR, written and illustrated by Richard S. Chattock.
"A SAILOR'S WIFE," by Lady Dunboyne.
"A VERY EXCEEDINGLY NAUGHTY LITTLE GIRL," by Lady Lindsay of Balcarres.
"WHALE'S CAVERN," by Mrs. Manners Lushington.
"WILFRID'S VIOLIN," by Mrs. Molesworth.
"COLOMBUS," by Frances M. Peard.
"BRIDE PICOTEE," by Miss Roberts, Author of "Mademoiselle Mori," "The Atelier du Lys," &c. With original Illustrations.
SONGS for Children by Alfred Scott Gatty, and INSTRUCTIVE ARTICLES by Charles H. Read, F.S.A., Charlotte S. Fursdon, Author of "A Soldier of the Seventeenth Century," &c., and other writers.

Competition Studies will be given on the subject of ENGLISH LITERATURE, Competitors being divided into three classes, according to age, and Prizes given at the end of the year. The first set of Questions will be in the November Number.

Crown 8vo, price One Shilling.

THE ELECTRIC LIGHT POPULARLY EXPLAINED. By A. BROMLEY HOLMES. With Thirty-two Illustrations.

This Work is first of all a Popular Handbook, giving the general reader, who has little or no previous knowledge of Electrical Science, an explanation in plain language of the means used for producing the Electric Light.

But it is also intended as a Practical Guide to afford those who think of adopting this mode of illumination sufficient information to enable them to form an opinion as to the most suitable method for their purpose.

London: BEMROSE and SONS, 23, Old Bailey; and Derby.

BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE, for OCTOBER, 1882. No. DCCCIV. Price 2s. 6d.

Contents:

ADOLPHUS: A COMEDY OF AFFINITIES.
TUNIS.
THE LADIES LINDORES.—Part VII.
IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.
THE ERSKINES AND THEIR KINSFOLK.
NOTTINGHAM LACE: ITS HISTORY AND MANUFACTURE.
URBS ROMA VALE!—Part II. By J. P. M.
THE STORY OF JAMES BARKER: A TALE OF THE CONGO COAST.
THE SITUATION IN EGYPT.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD and SONS, Edinburgh and London.

FOREIGN CLASSICS FOR ENGLISH READERS.

Edited by Mrs. OLIPHANT.

In Crown Octavo Volumes, each price 2s. 6d.

This Day is Published. VOL. XVI.

TASSO. By E. J. Hasell.

The Volumes published of this Series are:—

Dante, by the Editor. Voltaire, by Major-General Sir E. B. Hamley, K.C.M.G. Pascal, by Principal Tulloch. Petrarch, by Henry Reeve, C.B. Goethe, by A. Hayward, Q.C. Molière, by the Editor and F. Tarver, M.A. Montaigne, by Rev. W. Lucas Collins, M.A. Rabelais, by Walter Besant, M.A. Calderon, by E. J. Hasell. Saint Simon, by Clifton W. Collins, M.A. Cervantes, by the Editor. Corneille and Racine, by Henry M. Trollope. Madame de Sevigne, by Miss Thackeray (Mrs. Richmond Ritchie). La Fontaine, and other French Fabulists, by Rev. W. Lucas Collins, M.A. Schiller, by James Sime, M.A.

ROUSSEAU, by Henry Grey Graham. [Shortly.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD and SONS, Edinburgh and London.

PHILOSOPHICAL CLASSICS FOR ENGLISH READERS.

Edited by Professor KNIGHT, St. Andrews.

In crown 8vo. Volumes, with Portraits, price 3s. 6d.

Now ready—

1. **Descartes.**—By Professor Mahaffy, Dublin.
2. **Butler.**—By Rev. W. Lucas Collins, M.A.
3. **Berkeley.**—By Professor Fraser, Edinburgh.
4. **Fichte.**—By Professor Adamson, Owens College, Manchester.
5. **Kant.**—By William Wallace, M.A., LL.D., Oxford.

The Volumes in preparation are—

Hamilton, by Professor Veitch, Glasgow. Vico, by Professor Flint, Edinburgh. Spinoza, by the Very Rev. Principal Caird, Glasgow. Hobbes, by Professor Croom Robertson, London. Hume, by the Editor. Bacon, by Professor Nichol, Glasgow. Hegel, by Professor Edward Caird, Glasgow.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD and SONS, Edinburgh and London.

POPULAR NEW NOVELS.

NOW READY AT ALL LIBRARIES.

The Brandreths. By the Right Hon. A. J. B. BERESFORD-HOPE, M.P., Author of "Strictly Tied Up." 3 vols.

"This novel is one which will repay careful reading."—The Times.

Gabrielle de Bourdaine. By Mrs. John KENT SPENDER, Author of "Godwyn's Ordeal." 3 vols.

"A pleasant story in its quiet and simple way. It is readable and attractive."—Athenæum.

New Babylon. By Paul Meritt and W. HOWELL POOLE. 3 vols.

"A clever and amusing novel."—Daily Telegraph.

Saint and Sibyl. By C. L. Pirkis, Author of "A Very Opal," &c. 3 vols.

The Merchant Prince. By John Berwick HARWOOD, Author of "Lady Flavia," &c. 3 vols.

Red Ryvington. By William Westall, Author of "Larry Lohengrin," &c. 3 vols. [Next week.

HURST and BLACKETT, 13, Great Marlborough-street.

MACKESON'S GUIDE to the CHURCHES of LONDON and its SUBURBS for 1882 (Published with the sanction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of London, Winchester, Rochester, St. Albans, and Bedford), contains names and addresses of Clergy, readers, organists, choirmasters, and full details as to services, ritual, music, hymn books, architecture, organs, bells, &c., of every church within twelve miles of London.

METZLER, 37, Great Marlborough-street; PARKER, Southampton-street, Strand; WALTER SMITH, 34, King-street, Covent-garden; and of all Booksellers.

STAMMERERS AND STUTTERERS
Should purchase
A Little Book,
Written by a GENTLEMAN who
CURED HIMSELF,
After Suffering for Thirty Years.
From the Author,
B. BEASLEY, Green Bank House, Hall Green,
Near Birmingham.

WANTED.

SPECIAL PREPAID ADVERTISEMENTS.

Advertisements of Clerical, Educational, and Domestic Wants and Vacancies, will be received for insertion in this Column at the uniform charge of 2s. for 40 words, and 6d. for every additional ten words. Prepayment must in all cases be made, in stamps under 5s., above that by P.O.O. payable at Fleet Street *to* Thomas Dixon.

OPENING of ORGAN (St. Augustine's, Settler-street, Commercial-road, E).—The Dean of LICHFIELD will preach before the Lord Mayor on SUNDAY NEXT, Oct. 8, at 11 a.m. Collection for Organ Fund.

HOLY TRINITY, NEWINGTON, S.E. CURACY VACANT. Graduate. Good preacher and zealous worker. Hearty services. £150.—Rector.

ST. JAMES'S, UPPER EDMONTON, Middlesex.—ASSISTANT-CURATE WANTED. Active worker. Priest, under thirty-two. Daily services; weekly celebrations. £150. Address the Vicar.

A CURATE (Evangelical), WANTED, for St. Paul's, Clapham. Title given. Stipend according to standing. Address the Vicar, 18, Offerton-road, Clapham, S.W.

A CURATE for Snareston. £120, house (rent and taxes free), large garden. Member of E.C.U. and C.B.S. preferred. Population 350. Station.—Rector, Swepston, Ashby-de-la-Zouch.

CURATE WANTED. Diocese Lichfield Weekly celebration; daily Matins. Priest £150, or, if Title given, £120.—Rev. R. K. Haslehurst, West Felton Rectory, R.S.O., Shropshire.

CURATE WANTED, earnest, active, and efficient, to assist in charge of two small parishes. £120 and cottage.—Canon Stapelton, Old Maldon, Surrey.

CURATE WANTED, in November, for Dodderhill, Droitwich. Graduate. Full Orders. Address the Vicar.

CURATE WANTED, All Saints', Paddington, through preferment. Oxon or Cantab. Earnest worker. £150.—Rev. J. Maconechy, 8, Norfolk-square.

THE VICAR of Foleshill, near Coventry, has been nine months seeking an ASSISTANT-PRIEST. Parish large and scattered, needing a good visitor. Dissent being rife, careful teaching and moderate ritual necessary. Choral services, daily prayer, and frequent Eucharists. Very healthy neighbourhood. A real work to be done.

WANTED, CURATE, for Mission work in the Black Country. Healthy parish. Three Clergy. £140.—Vicar, Netherton, Dudley.

LOCUM TENENS WANTED, for a few months or less. Population 362. Views moderate. Parish about five miles from the sea. Rooms in vicarage. Servants left. Terms to be arranged. Single.—M. A., Boro'-green, Sevenoaks.

LOCUM TENENS REQUIRED, near London. Light duty; choral services. House, garden, and servants. For five Sundays, from October 29 inclusive.—Rev. C. Swainson, Rectory, Old Charlton.

COUNTRY CURACY WANTED, by Cambridge Graduate, in Gloucestershire or Somersetshire (near Bristol preferred). Eastward position and daily service desired. Address T. F., 16, Princes-street, Rotherhithe, S.E.

CURACY WANTED, now. Lancashire preferred. Moderate High Churchman. Married. Musical (organ); can intone. Good references.—Clericus, Heptonstall, Manchester.

CURACY, with Title at Lent, WANTED, by a B.A. of Trinity College, Dublin, who expects his Divinity Testimonium in December. Views moderate. Country preferred.—T. L., Edgbaston House, Pittville, Cheltenham.

CURACY WANTED, after Xmas. by Priest. Views moderate. Fond of work. Somewhat musical. Address Curate, Tivetshall, Scole.

CURACY WANTED. Earnest work, in midland town. Prayer-Book views. Graduate. Priest. Musical. Young. Single. Address B. A., 38, Clarendon-st., Nottingham.

TITLE WANTED, for Advent. Diocese G. and B. Fond of work. Address B. H., Park-place, Pitt-street, Gloucester.

TITLE WANTED, for Advent. Moderate. Country or small town preferred. Chichester Theological.—J. C. Arthy, 48, North-street, Chichester.

A LADY, middle-aged, very musical, and highly recommended, desires appointment as COMPANION, Chaperon, or otherwise. Clergyman's family preferred, as she would conduct Organ and Choir. Young children not objected to. Moderate salary. Address Delta, Portswood, Southampton.

WANTED, a Lady, as NURSERY GOVERNESS, for two little boys, eldest seven years. Good disciplinarian. Entire charge. Age not under twenty-six. Address Mrs. Smith, Church Farm, Stapleford, Salisbury.

WANTED, a GOVERNESS, for two girls and boy, ages fourteen, ten, and seven. Address Mrs. Bryant, St. Peter Tavy Rectory, Tavistock, Devonshire.

WANTED, a NURSERY GOVERNESS for four children, aged from four to ten years, in a good country home. Must be strictly Evangelical. Age from thirty to forty. Address S. S., Mrs. Jenkins, Wallingford, Berks.

WOULD any Lady recommend Girl about sixteen as SEWING and SCHOOLROOM MAID? Address Mrs. J., Cherrington Park, Stroud.

A LADY will be much obliged if any lady will recommend her a thoroughly good NURSE, between thirty and thirty-five years of age, who is clever in the management of infants, and kind and judicious with elder children, and who is an intelligent, capable woman. Please address Mrs. C., May's advertising offices, 159, Piccadilly.

WANTED, Young Woman, as plain COOK, or General Servant. Good personal character required. Apply at Elmleigh, Hayne-road, Beckenham.

FIRST-CLASS
FURNITURE.

MANUFACTURERS OF
BEDROOM SUITES.
500 Bedroom Suites.
From 75s. to 200 Guineas.

BED-ROOM SUITES, in Pine, 5½ Guineas.

BED-ROOM SUITES, in Solid Ash, plate-glass door to Wardrobe, Washstand fitted with Minton's Tiles, £10 15s.

BED-ROOM SUITES, in Solid Walnut, plate-glass door to Wardrobe, Washstand fitted with Minton's Tiles, £11 15s.

BED-ROOM SUITES, in Solid Walnut, plate-glass door to Wardrobe, Washstand fitted with Minton's Tiles, and Chest of Drawers, £14 14s.

BEDROOM SUITES, in Solid Ash or Walnut, with large plate-glass door to Wardrobe, Washstand fitted with Minton's Tiles, large Chest of Drawers, £18 18s.

The Largest Furnishing Establishment in the World.
MAPLE & CO.,
Tottenham-court-road, London.

POSTAL ORDER DEPARTMENT.

Messrs. MAPLE and CO. beg respectfully to state that this department is now so organised that they are fully prepared to supply any article that can possibly be required in furnishing at the same price, if not less than any other house in England. Patterns sent and quotations given free of charge.

MAPLE & CO.,

Tottenham Court Road,
LONDON, W.
THE LARGEST AND MOST CONVENIENT.
Furnishing Establishment
IN THE WORLD.

ARTISTIC CARPETS.

TURKEY (5,000 to select from) **CARPETS.**
TURKEY (of all sizes) **CARPETS.**
TURKEY (Superior Qualities) **CARPETS.**

THE Largest Assortment of INDIAN, PERSIAN, and TURKEY CARPETS always in stock. Superior qualities. Purchasers must beware of inferior Turkey carpets, which are now being manufactured and sold as best quality at so much per square yard.—MAPLE and CO., Tottenham-court-road.

PERSIAN (500 in Stock) **CARPETS.**
PERSIAN (Superior qualities) **CARPETS.**
PERSIAN (Choice Colourings) **CARPETS.**

A PERSIAN CARPET for 30s., measuring about 10 feet long by 5 feet wide. 5,000 to select from. The Goods are regularly imported by MAPLE and CO., and are very durable, being the best of this make.—145 to 149, Tottenham-court-road, London.

MAPLE & CO., are now offering
FIFTY MILES of CARPETS at 3s. 9d. per yard.

THESE BRUSSELS CARPETS, by some of the first manufacturers, are of superior quality, the designs and colourings new and artistic. They are 1s. per yard under the usual price asked at the West End for the same quality.

EARLY-ENGLISH
FURNITURE.

CRETONNES.
CRETONNES.
CRETONNES.
CRETONNES.
5,000 Pieces in Stock, Patterns sent free.

ART CRETONNES.—The largest stock of this new and fashionable material in London; some new and exclusive designs just received, not to be obtained elsewhere. Those who study taste should see these goods before ordering. Patterns sent into the country on receiving a description of what is likely to be required.

BEDSTEADS.
BEDSTEADS.
BEDSTEADS.
BEDSTEADS.
BEDSTEADS.
BEDSTEADS.
10,000 Brass and Iron in Stock from 8s. 6d. to 50 Guineas.

MAPLE & Co.,
THE
LARGEST AND MOST CONVENIENT
FURNISHING ESTABLISHMENT
IN THE WORLD.

A house of any magnitude furnished from stock in three days. Purchasers should inspect this stock before deciding elsewhere. All goods marked in plain figures.

Established 41 Years.

FISHING BOOTS,
FISHING STOCKINGS,
FISHING BROGUES,

VENTILATING WATERPROOF COATS,

AND EVERY WATERPROOF REQUISITE FOR THE ANGLER.

J. C. CORDING AND CO., 19, PICCADILLY.

(Corner of Air-street.) Only Address.

CASH'S EMBROIDERED NAMES AND INITIAL LETTERS. Any Name Embroidered on our fine Cambric Tape in Turkey Red, which can be sewn on to any article of dress requiring to be marked. Price 6s. 6d. for twelve dozen. The Initial Letters, 3s. for twelve dozen. Retailed by Drapers everywhere. Samples post free of J. and J. CASH, Coventry.

CASH'S CAMBRIC FRILLING. Very suitable for trimming Ladies' and Children's underclothing; the spécialité of which is the Drawing Cord woven into the Cambric. Retail of Drapers everywhere.

CASH'S EMBROIDERED FRILLING. These Embroidered Frillings have the same quality and uses as our Cambric Frilling, but are embroidered with colours in various designs. Retail of Drapers everywhere.

CASH'S "THREE SPIRES" TOWEL The "Three Spires" Towel has just been introduced as a Ladies' Friction Bath Towel. Retailed by Drapers everywhere.

CASH'S ROUGH BATH TOWEL. These Towels have quite a unique appearance, and each one bears our Name on the Fringe. Retail of all Drapers.

CARSONS' PAINT,

PATRONISED BY
HER MAJESTY,
H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES,
15,000 of the Nobility, Gentry, and Clergy.

Is extensively used for all kinds of
OUTDOOR WORK,
Standing extremes of
HEAT AND COLD.

CAN BE LAID ON BY UNSKILLED LABOUR.

1 CWT., and Oil Mixture, Free to all Stations.

PRICES, PATTERNS, AND TESTIMONIALS POST FREE.

CARSONS,
LA BELLE SAUVAGE YARD,
LUDGATE HILL, LONDON, E.C.
AND
21, BACHELOR'S WALK, DUBLIN.
DISCOUNT FOR CASH.
NO AGENTS.

CAN any Lady recommend a thoroughly good SECOND NURSE, to work under a governess (French or English) and to go abroad? Must have first-rate character from last situation. Address L., care of May and Williams, 160, Piccadilly.

The Public are invited to send, from any part of the world, to ROBINSON and CLEAVER, BELFAST, for Samples and full range of Price Lists (POST FREE) of their

IRISH LINEN, "Their Irish Linen Collars, Cuffs, Shirts, &c., have the merits of excellence and cheapness."—Court Circular.

COLLARS, Ladies' and Children's 3-fold, 3s. 11d. per doz. Gents' 4-fold, 4s. 11d. to 5s. 11d. per doz.

Specially appointed to supply H.M. the Queen, &c., &c. **CUFFS,** For Ladies, Gentlemen, & Children, 5s. 11d. to 10s. 9d. per doz.

Best Longcloth Bodies, with 4-fold all linen fronts and cuffs, 35s. 6d. the half-doz. (to measure, 2s. extra). **& SHIRTS.**

IRISH Real Irish Linen Sheeting, 2 yards wide, 1s. 11d. per yard. Extra Heavy (a most durable article), 2½ yards wide, 3s. 3d. per yard. Roller Towelling, 18in. wide, 3½d. per yard.

Surplice Linen, 8½d. per yard. **LINENS** Linen Dusters, 3s. 3d., Glass Cloths, 4s. 6d. per dozen. Fine Linens & Linen Diaper, 10d. per yard.

Fish Napkins, 3s. 6d. per doz. Dinner Napkins, 6/6 per doz. **& DAMASKS.**

Table Cloths, 2 yds. square, 3s. 11d.; 2½ yds. by 4 yds., 13s. 4d. each

CAMBRIC
Children's...... 2s. 6d. per doz.
Ladies' .... 3s. 3d. „
Gentlemen's .. 4s. 10d. „

All Pure Flax. **POCKET**
HEMSTITCHED.
Ladies' .. 4s. 9d. per doz.
Gents' .. 8s. 4d. „

HANDKERCHIEFS.

"The Irish Cambrics of Messrs. Robinson and Cleaver have a world-wide fame."—The Queen.

ROBINSON AND CLEAVER,
BELFAST.

By Special Appointment to H.M. the Queen and Her Imperial Highness the Crown Princess of Germany.

IMPROVED JANUS CORD (Registered),
BOTH SIDES ALIKE,
1½ Guineas the full dress length.

Made specially for Messrs. JAY, and recommended by them as the best and the cheapest material at the price ever manufactured for a lady's dress. JANUS CORD makes up remarkably well, and ladies who habitually wear black will find it an excellent wearing dress.

JAY'S, REGENT-STREET.

JANUS CORD FOR WEAR BY BISHOPS AND CLERGYMEN.

MESSRS. JAY have received more orders for this material than for any other Cloth manufactured for them. It is soft, pliable, washes without loss of colour, and looks well to the last. The Clergy are now using it extensively for Coats, Cassocks, and Aprons, made by a superior Tailor on the premises.

JAY'S, REGENT-STREET.

TO MESSRS. JAY, REGENT-STREET.

Gentlemen,—Mrs. —— having for years past worn the Janus Cord as an inimitable material for dress, I was induced to try it for a Clerical Coat, which, by the way, was admirably cut and fitted by your Tailor, and I think it right to add that it wears and looks remarkably well, besides being light, easy, and comfortable. For Cassocks, Aprons, and Waistcoats it will, I am sure, be found the best and cheapest material that Bishops and Clergy can select.

I am, Gentlemen, your obedient servant,
CLERICUS OXONIENSIS.

JAY'S,
THE LONDON GENERAL MOURNING WAREHOUSE,
REGENT-STREET, W.

GUARDIAN FIRE and LIFE OFFICE,
11, LOMBARD STREET, LONDON E.C.
Established 1821. Subscribed Capital Two Millions.

DIRECTORS.
Chairman—JOHN G. TALBOT, Esq., M.P.
Deputy-Chairman—ALBAN G. H. GIBBS, Esq.

Henry Hulse Berens, Esq.
Hy. Bonham-Carter, Esq.
Charles Wm. Curtis, Esq.
Charles F. Devas, Esq.
Sir Walter R. Farquhar, Bart.
James Goodson, Esq.
Thomson Hankey, Esq.
Richard M. Harvey, Esq.
Rt. Hon. J. G. Hubbard, M.P.
Frederick H. Janson, Esq.
Rt. Hn. G. J. Shaw Lefevre, M.P.
Beaumont W. Lubbock, Esq.
John B. Martin, Esq.
S. Hope Morley, Esq.
Henry John Norman, Esq.
David Powell, Esq.
Augustus Prevost, Esq.
Henry Vigne, Esq.

Manager of Fire Department—F. J. MARSDEN.
Actuary and Secretary—T. G. C. BROWNE.

Share Capital at present paid up and invested ..	£1,000,000.
Total Funds upwards of	2,941,000.
Total Annual Income over	517,000.

N.B.—Fire Policies which expire at Michaelmas should be renewed at the Head Office, or with the Agents, on or before the 14th day of October.

PHŒNIX FIRE OFFICE,
LOMBARD STREET and CHARING CROSS, LONDON.
ESTABLISHED 1782.

TRUSTEES AND DIRECTORS.

The Henble. Jas. Byng.
John Clutton, Esq.
Octavius E. Coope, Esq., M.P.
George Arthur Fuller, Esq.
Charles Emanuel Goodhart, Esq.
M. Rohde Hawkins, Esq.
Sir John Lubbock, Bart., M.P., F.R.S.
Charles Thomas Lucas, Esq.
Charles Magnay, Esq.
The Hon. Edwin B. Portman.
Charles Rivaz, Esq.
Dudley Robert Smith, Esq.
Wm. James Thompson, Esq.

AUDITORS.
Walter Bird, Esq.
Joseph Francis Lescher, Esq.
Charles Day Rose, Esq.

John J. Broomfield, Secretary.
Francis B. Macdonald, Assistant Secretary.

Insurances against Loss by Fire and Lightning are effected by the PHŒNIX COMPANY upon every description of Property, in all parts of the World, on the most favourable Terms.

The promptitude and liberality with which its engagements are always met by this Company are well known, and the importance of its relations with the Public may be estimated from the fact that since its establishment it has paid in discharge of Claims for Losses more than

THIRTEEN MILLIONS STERLING.

Insurances with this Company expiring at Michaelmas must be renewed within Fifteen days thereafter, or they will become Void.

Receipts are now ready at the principal Offices, Lombard-street and Charing-cross, and with the respective Agents throughout the United Kingdom.

SPECULATION & INVESTMENT IN STOCKS & SHARES,

WITH A MINIMUM RISK.

Explanatory Book, Just Published, Gratis and Post Free on Application.

Operators in Stock Exchange Securities should test this system, by which LARGE PROFITS are realised, and the possibility of losses is reduced to a Minimum.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

Civil Service Gazette: "The method recommended by Messrs. Gutteridge and Co. is easy to comprehend, and safe."

John Bull: "An easy and apparently safe system, worthy of public confidence."

Court Journal: "An excellent way of speculating ably set forth."

Civilian: "Their system commends itself as being a very safe one."

News of the World: "Their book is well worth reading. One cannot do better than retain their services."

W. GUTTERIDGE and CO.,
Sworn Brokers,
7, DRAPERS' GARDENS, THROGMORTON STREET E.C.

A CLERGYMAN preparing sons of Noblemen and Gentlemen for the Universities, the Army, the Civil Service, and Public Schools, wishes to meet with a GENTLEMAN who would be willing to INVEST from £2,000 to £3,000 as Additional Capital without participation in management. Excellent grouse and mixed shooting, trout fishing, hunting, &c. Large country house, a good return guaranteed by private Deed of Partnership or arrangement. Principals and their solicitors only treated with. Apply to Messrs. Barker, Sons, and Yeoman, Solicitors, Huddersfield.

THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

[*Continued from p. 648 of Supplement.*]

WEDNESDAY.

In the Drillhall, on Wednesday morning, the subject discussed was "The Church and Modern Thought," and in connection with it Professor STOKES read the following paper :—

THE HARMONY OF SCIENCE AND FAITH.

To those who believe that the order of nature is in accordance with the will of a Supreme Being, it must be axiomatic that there can be no real opposition between what we learn from the study of nature and what we may be taught by a direct revelation from that Being. We cannot suppose otherwise without impugning the truthfulness of God. Any apparent opposition must therefore arise from some deficiency in the student of Science or in the student of Revelation, or in both.

There are two ways in which it might be imagined that the pursuit of science might be injurious to religion; either by its leading, or being supposed to lead, to conclusions at variance with what is, or is supposed to be, the teaching of revelation, or by its fostering a tone of mind hostile to the cultivation of religious feeling.

The subject matters of religion and science are so different that the cases in which there could be any room for an apparent conflict of conclusions are comparatively rare, touching only the outer borders. They may arise from mistakes on either side respecting the evidence on which the supposed conclusions are based. The man of science may overrate the evidence on which his supposed conclusion is founded, and may regard some ingenious working hypothesis with the confidence due only to a well-established theory. The student of revelation may forget how much the working of his own mind is involved in the deduction of conclusions from the materials before him, and may accordingly transfer to that which is human, and as such liable to error, the reverence which he feels to be due to all that comes from the author of that revelation.

Let me refer to an example or two. The opposition to the Copernican system on the ground of its supposed contradiction of a passage in the Book of Psalms belongs to times long gone by. But it is well within the memory of the present generation how geologists were looked on as semi-infidels because, resting on the clear evidence which their science afforded of the antiquity of the earth, and of the succession of animal life upon it, they ventured to call in question the correctness of an opinion that the earth was created and furnished, or at least brought into its present state from a previous state of chaos, in six literal days of twenty-four hours, and that to disbelieve this was tantamount to rejecting revelation altogether. The progress of knowledge has pretty well dispelled this notion as well as the other, and I doubt if any theologians at the present day think that the cause of religion has suffered in consequence.

Let me turn now to the other side. A subject which is exciting a great deal of interest at the present day is what is called evolution. Some think that we must make our choice between evolution and revelation; others think that there is no inconsistency between the two.

Suppose that we are in a lead mine, and contemplate the crystals of galena, fluor spar, &c., with which the cavities in the mine are lined. The question may occur to our minds, how came they there? Were they created as they stand, or did they grow by natural laws out of a previous condition in which they were not there? A person who knew absolutely nothing of natural science might, perhaps, say that they were created. But one who was better informed would know that crystallisation is a process going on constantly in the chemical laboratory, and in some cases observed to be taking place in nature, even at the present day, without any intervention on the part of man; that several of the natural crystallised minerals have now been formed artificially; and that there is good reason for thinking that the earth was in former ages in a very different condition, a condition in which the presence of water, combined with a high temperature, was eminently favourable to crystallisations which can hardly now take place. A person such as I have now supposed, would naturally attribute the presence of the crystals in the cavities of the mine to the ordinary processes of crystallisation; he would look on the present state of things as something *evolved* under the operation of the ordinary physical laws out of a prior state that was different.

Let us turn now to another example, in part imaginary. Suppose that we knew nothing of the earth and planets except their motions in accordance with the law of gravitation, and nothing of the nebulæ, and did not know that the solar radiation involves an expenditure of energy which has in some way to be accounted for. The motions of the bodies of the solar system can be calculated years beforehand, as is done in the *Nautical Almanack* office; and, in the same way, their places years ago can be inferred from their present known orbits. In the supposed state of our knowledge there would be nothing to indicate that they might not continue their motions for ever in the same way, or that the present state grew out of a previous state which was different. If the question were asked, how came they to be as they are? one man might answer they were always so; another, they were created as they stand. Of course it would remain possible that the present state *might* have grown out of a previous different state merely in accordance with existing physical laws, but there would be nothing (under the supposed limitation of our knowledge) to justify us in assuming that it *did*. And if a further accession to our knowledge precluded, as it does preclude, the supposition that the planets have been always just as they are, the other two alternatives remain, that they were created as they stand, or that they grew into their present condition by the operation of physical laws out of a previous different state. If there were no indications of growth out of a different state, we should not be justified in assuming that it was thus that they came into their present condition, though of course neither could we assume the contrary. On the second supposition the question, what was that previous state, and how grew they out of it? is one belonging to the province of science, whether science can or cannot find a satisfactory answer; on the first supposition, the question is one with which science has nothing to do, as it lies wholly outside its domain. The point I want to insist on is, that *unless* we see indications of growth from a previous different state, we have no right to assume that the question belongs to the domain of science at all, or to reject the alternative supposition.

These examples, taken from the physical division of natural science were intended to lead on to the consideration of certain questions arising in the other, the biological, branch which have of late years excited a great deal of attention, and with which, from a theological point of view, we are more nearly concerned.

Naturalists recognise an enormous number of so-called species of plants and animals. It is true that the distinction between a species and a mere variety is often doubtful; for though species admits of a theoretical definition, the working out of that definition experimentally involves so much time and patience that practically we are left to reason by analogy of what we do happen to know in similar cases. Where some general resemblance is combined with differences greater than our experience warrants us in attributing to mere breed, we are obliged to regard the individuals as belonging to different species; but inasmuch as this is a conclusion depending on lack of evidence to the contrary, and the evidence we have is far short of that which it is conceivably possible to obtain, it is clear that the tendency must be towards the multiplication of species. But with every allowance for such multiplication, is evident that the number of species will still be enormously great. And large as is this number already, it is very greatly increased when we include the plants and animals of past ages which, or more probably only a portion of which, are preserved to us in a fossilised state.

The question then naturally arises, how came this great number of species to be as they are? Are we obliged to suppose that each member of this vast array originated in an isolated and independent creative act; or may we regard the observed condition as naturally evolved, under the operation of laws either known, or conceivably open to scientific investigation from some preceding condition of a simpler character?

There is nothing at all atheistic in proposing the latter question, or in answering it in the affirmative in case we should find reasonable scientific evidence in favour of an affirmative answer. It is a different thing altogether to assume *à priori*, independently of any evidence, that such *must* have been the case. For if this were allowable, had we a right to assume that the present condition (*a*) *must* have grown naturally out a different preceding condition (*b*), then by parity of reasoning we should have a right to assume that the condition (*b*) grew naturally out of a different preceding condition (*c*), and so on indefinitely. This comes to removing God to an infinite distance, and that again comes practically to much the same thing as denying his existence altogether. At least it comes to this *unless* we regard those laws, such as the law of gravitation and so forth, as by themselves alone evidence of a presiding mind, of whose will they are the expression; but this is a point of view hardly I think attainable by the uneducated, and even as regards the educated calculated to strike different persons differently, according to their various mental complexions.

To him who believes in a God it is conceivable that the end He designs to accomplish might be brought about by an immediate *fiat* of his will, in a manner wholly beyond our conception, or that contrivances might be employed adapting means to an end, and ordered in accordance with laws open to our investigation. It needs but little acquaintance with the phenomena of nature to perceive that beneficent ends are constantly brought about through the operation of simple laws open to our investigation. To take a single example, regard the structure of the eye. The wonderful sense of sight in its integrity involves mysteries which we cannot fathom; but this much is clear, that it depends in some way on the formation of distinct images on the retina. Now how is this effected? Why, there is an elaborate organ provided which refracts the rays of light so as to form images according to the very same principles as operate in the formation of images in the focus of a telescope constructed by the practical optician. Seeing, then, that useful ends are brought about by means, we should expect *à priori* that as the wisdom of the designing mind must be immeasurably above our own, so contrivance should as a rule extend far beyond what we can trace. We should expect, therefore, *on purely theistic grounds*, that the doctrine of evolution, assumed for trial, would be a useful and ordinarily trustworthy guide in our scientific researches; that it might often enable us to go back one step, and explain how such or such a result was brought about by natural laws from such or such an anterior condition, and so might lead us to extend our knowledge of the operation of natural causes. But this is a very different thing from assuming it as an axiom, the application of which may be extended step by step indefinitely backwards.

The only theory, so far as I am aware, in which an attempt is made to refer the phenomenon to known natural causes is that famous one with which the name of the eminent naturalist who has but recently departed from among us is inseparably connected. The theory of ancestral derivation and the survival of the fittest is one which from its nature can hardly, if at all, be made a subject of experimental investigation, or even of observation in the records of the past. So far as it may be accepted, it must rest mainly on the estimate which may be formed of its own inherent probability; though doubtless an underlying feeling that the phenomenon must in some way be explicable by natural causes has contributed not a little towards its propagation.

The theory, I need hardly say, is highly ingenious, but any variation which we can actually observe goes but an infinitesimal way towards bridging over the interval which separates extreme forms, such for example as an elephant and a mollusc. Indeed, Darwin himself, as I am informed, was of opinion at first that we required at least four or five distinct centres to start with. The theory has been accepted by many eminent biologists with a readiness that is puzzling to an outsider, especially one accustomed to the severe demands for evidence that are made in the physical sciences. I think a large number of scientific men would admit that it is very far indeed from being admissible to the rank of a well-established theory, however ingenious as a hypothesis; true possibly as accounting for permanent or sub-permanent differences between allied forms, but not conceivably bridging over the great gulf which separates remote forms of life.

As to the origin of life itself, it was not intended on this theory to account for it, and the experimental researches of our foremost scientific men are adverse to the supposition of its production by spontaneous generation. Granting the origin of life by a creative act, we are not very closely concerned, theologically speaking, with the mode of creation. The scriptural account of the Creation seems indeed to imply successive creative acts; and the supposition that there were such relieves us of certain scientific difficulties, by placing those difficulties outside the domain of science, and falls in with what we are taught to expect in the future. But there is one point in which I think that theology is more deeply involved; I allude to the creation of man. In the account of the Creation it is distinctly stated that man was separately created, "in the image of God," whatever that may imply. Nor is this a point in which, by a licence of interpretation, we might say that the language was merely figurative; that we can afford to understand it so, for that Scripture was not given to teach us science. Our whole ideas respecting the nature of sin and the character of God are, as it seems to me, profoundly affected according as we take the statement of Scripture straightforwardly, which implies that man was created with special powers and privileges, and in a state of innocence, from which he fell, or, as we suppose, that man came to be what he is by degrees, by a vast number of infinitesimal variations from some lower order of animal, accompanied by a correspondingly continuous variation in his mental and moral condition. On this latter supposition, God is made to be responsible for his present moral condition, which is but the natural outgrowth of the mode of his creation. As regards the lower animals, little change would apparently be made, from a theological point of view, if we were to interpret as figurative the language which seems to assert a succession of creative acts. But the creation of man and his condition at creation are not confined to the account given in Genesis; they are dwelt on at length, in connection with the scheme of redemption, by St. Paul, and more briefly referred to by our Lord Himself, in connection with the institution of marriage.

Now against these statements, so express, so closely bound up with man's highest aspirations, what evidence have we to adduce on the side of science? Why, nothing more than a hypothesis of continuous transmutation, incapable of experimental investigation, and making such demands upon our imagination as to stagger at least the uninitiated.

If an undue literalism of interpretation on the theological side created apparent opposition between science and faith in respect to the Copernican system, and to the antiquity of the earth and of life upon it, I cannot help thinking that here apparent opposition arises from the erection, on the other side, of a scientific hypothesis into the rank of a well-established theory.

Some have endeavoured to combine the statements of Scripture with a modified hypothesis of continuous transmutation, by supposing that at a certain epoch in the world's history mental and moral powers were conferred by Divine interposition on some animal that had been gradually modified in its bodily structure by natural causes till it took the form of man. As special interposition and special creation are here recognised, I do not see that religion has anything to lose by the adoption of this hypothesis; but neither do I see that science has anything to gain. Once admit special Divine interposition, and science has come to the end of her tether. Those who find the idea helpful can adopt it; but, for my own part, this combination of the natural and the supernatural seems somewhat grotesque, and I prefer resting on the statement of a special creation, without prying into its method.

But some may be apprehensive that though the claims of revealed religion and of science upon our acceptance hardly touch one another at all, and if ever they do, are when properly understood in no wise in conflict, yet the habit of mind which the pursuit of science fosters may be hostile to the acceptance of revealed religion.

Now, it is perfectly true that a too exclusive devotion of the mind to one subject has a tendency to dwarf such of its powers as are not called into exercise. But to object to the study of science on that ground would be like objecting to honest industry on the ground that the inordinate pursuit of riches absorbs the mind to the exclusion of better things.

But is there nothing in the study of science which may have a not merely innocuous, but even beneficial, influence in religious matters? I think there is, in more ways than one; but time would not permit of my referring to more than one. In the study of the phenomena of nature, there is one quality which is pre-eminently called into exercise, and that is truthfulness. The investigator who wishes to be successful must be on his guard against prejudice, and hold his mind ready to receive fresh indications of truth hitherto unperceived. And is not this what should be our attitude as regards Divine truth? New light will break in upon us from time to time if we seek after truth, and keep our minds honestly open to its reception. This requires patience and effort; and there is sometimes a temptation to take a short cut to truth by throwing oneself into the arms of some party or school of thought, instead of borrowing from all alike that which to the honest seeker after truth appears to be good and sound, and rejecting that which appears to be false, thus proving all things, and holding fast that which is good. This honesty of mind, which leads to the recognition of that which is good in all parties, and to the avoidance of party spirit, is, I believe, fostered by scientific study.

The Bishop of LICHFIELD expressed regret that Dr. A. Clark was unable to be present, reading a brief note from him desiring that some one would notice what had not been pointed out—viz., that there was nothing absolute in the whole objective world; no accuracy or permanency even in physical laws.

The Bishop of BEDFORD, while admitting the greatness and grandeur of what was called law, pointed out that there was a group of facts and phenomena which refused to be governed by law, such as the phenomena of the will, the conscience, and the reason of man. If they were brought under the dominion of law we should be landed in fatalism, and there would be no room for religion, morality, right, or wrong.

Canon BARRY held that the real opposition between science and faith was the cultivation on either side of a temper so exclusively devoted to the one as to refuse to recognise the province of the other. What Christians had to do was to maintain the province of faith as a great and necessary part of human life, and as a power perhaps the most influential of all our human nature. The law of faith was a condition of life and progress, and for that natural law there was a supernatural foundation in revelation which was final and absolute.

At the afternoon meeting in the Drillhall, a very numerous gathering was present Earl NELSON commenced the proceedings by reading the following paper :—

THE POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE CHURCH TO THE CROWN.

In the programme of the proceedings of the Congress this division of the question of the relations of the Church and the State is succeeded by two others —"The Church and Parliament," "The Church and Democracy."

This places me in some difficulty in dealing with my special branch under the heading of "The Political Relations of the Church to the Crown."

The theory of an anointed King as being a sort of *mixta persona*—part secular and part spiritual—though of considerable age, I should hardly consider as worthy of serious discussion.

I know of no other political relation of the Church to the Crown, regarded as distinct from the supreme governing body of the realm, except such as may have been created from time to time in favour of any individual Sovereign on personal grounds, and such relations would necessarily determine on the determination of that personal sovereignty. To exemplify this form of relationship, and to show its distinction from that of the relationship towards the supreme civil authority :—

I would refer to the group of promises as to synodal action embodied in the *submissio cleri* made by the Church in her synods A.D. 1532, and extorted by the King under the terrors of a *præmunire*.

The fulsome flatteries of that document are discreditable; but they show distinctly that the promises made to the King were *personal* promises, made on the ground of certain spiritual and intellectual qualifications alleged to be in Henry VIII. as an *individual*, and by no means in the wearer of the Crown *ex officio*.

With the life of this Royal paragon, therefore, the spiritual obligation of the promises necessarily determined; and although the concessions of the synod—mutilated, indeed, and altered, and with the chief qualifications and conditions suppressed—were subsequently embodied in the Act of Submission, and so became part of the ordinary civil relations of the clergy—as an estate of the realm—to the Crown as the representative of the civil supremacy, this was no Act of the Church, and involved her in no new spiritual obligation. Such special cases as the *submissio cleri* excepted, the Crown is nothing but the *ex officio* equivalent of the supreme civil authority, and in this latter light I consider in this paper the Royal power in its relation to the Church.

The Royal supremacy is the most convenient term to express the authority of the civil power in matters of religion, and we may take for granted in respect to it these three points :—

1. That every independent Sovereign State is inherently possessed of supreme and absolute authority in and over all matters, and every part thereof of its political constitution, so as to be amenable to no authority but that of Almighty God.

2. That it is competent to every such State to assume, as an integral part and element of its political constitution, *a religious* as well as a secular organisation for the purpose of making a public profession of religion and of giving it due effect in practice.

3. That this authority of religious self-organisation is an integral and inseparable branch of *general political supremacy*.

It is to the civil power that the words of the Bible refer :—Rom. xiii. 1.—"Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God; whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God." The religious laws of the supreme civil power, not being contrary to the law of God, are legally and morally binding as law on all subjects of that power to whom it is applicable to precisely the same extent and on precisely the same grounds as the secular laws of the same power—there is but one root, one life, one *vis* to all alike. This civil independence in matters of religion is a prerogative of all States, wherever religion may be accepted by the State, whether Pagan, or Mohammedan, or Christian, and whether that Christian religion approach the scheme of the Independents or the religion of the Catholic Church.

If there is no accommodation possible between the religion of the State and the religion held by the individual citizen, he must judge by his own conscience which he must obey, submitting patiently to the correction which the State may see fit to inflict for disobedience.

So far as to the definition of the Royal supremacy.

Of the Church, it will be enough to say that I mean that visible but spiritual society founded and established by our Lord before His Ascension, to which He committed "the faith once delivered to the saints," and over which He appointed the Apostles and their successors with spiritual power and authority and jurisdiction throughout all the world, to continue always even unto the end.

But it is important to make quite clear the distinction between the Church as so defined and the Establishment, which, though popularly so considered, are in no sense synonymous terms.

The Establishment may be regarded in two aspects: —(1) as a *religion—i.e.*, as a system of doctrine and discipline and ceremonial; and in this aspect it may be any religion legalised or established by law, and so made its own by any State or nation; or (2) it is the State or political society so establishing it, *or the State manifested as a religious personality.*

The essential difference between the two is manifest by a simple reference to history. Despised, scorned, and often persecuted by the earthly power, the Church held calmly on its way in spite of all opposition for 300 years. So long as the original antagonism lasted the difference is sufficiently apparent.

The State held to its religion in spite of the Church, and the Church held to hers in spite of the State. The State persecuted, the Church suffered persecution; by patience and submission acknowledging the authority which she *could* not obey, but of which she accounted herself entirely independent in all matters relating to her own functions and mission, while never guilty of any encroachment on the political authority of the State in which she had no share.

When the empire became Christian no difference was thereby made in these distinct authorities. The Church had understood and acted on her commission for 300 years, and her charter abiding ever the same her authority must have remained unchangeable. And in like manner the authority of religious self-government inherent in the State, by virtue of which it had the power and right to embrace Christianity, was in no degree whatever altered, increased, or diminished by being brought into concord with the collateral spiritual authority of the Church. "Ye truly," said Constantine, to the assembled prelates, "are constituted by God Bishops of the things within the Church; I of the things without"—*i.e.*, the things of the State.

But the proof of the distinction of the two authorities was continually being manifested.

When the supreme power was Arian the Establishment was Arianised and the Church persecuted. When the Sovereign was Catholic the Establishment reverted to the Catholic type and heresy was repressed.

It is evident that the Arianism of Constantius did not make the Church Arian any more than the Catholicity of Constantine made her Catholic, or the Paganism of Julian made her Pagan, or the heresy of Justinian made her Phantasiast.

Heresy could attach itself to the Church only through the Bishops as her spiritual princes formally embracing it. State heresy contaminated and State orthodoxy purged the State religion only.

Again, at the final collapse of the Roman empire of the West, the Establishment was temporarily swept away; but the Church remained to be the spiritual conqueror of the temporal conquerors. In our own country this spiritual victory was obtained by direct missions among our heathen ancesters, from the British and Celtic Churches, and by Augustine's Mission, sent by Pope Gregory the Great, till our rulers again embraced Christianity, and established the Christian religion in one consolidated kingdom.

After the re-establishment of Christianity as the religion of the separated kingdoms of Europe, as they were one by one formed from the chaos occasioned by the irruption of the barbarous hordes, grew up by gradual aggrandisement the Papal supremacy.

At the time of the Reformation it was *this domination of the Court of Rome* that was primarily protested against. And we find the Church of this land, through the clergy, as the ecclesiastical estate of this realm, renouncing the political sovereignty of the Court of Rome, and recognising the King as supreme head, so far as is allowed by the law of Christ, of all things ecclesiastical and temporal in this kingdom; but by so doing they surrendered nothing that they held of Divine right; but simply renounced the political sovereignty which the Court of Rome held over them, to the prejudice of their lawful Prince. An extract from Cranmer's examination (*Foxe*, Vol. VIII., p. 68, Catley ed.) proves this:—

> After this Dr. Martin demanded of him, "Who was supreme Head of the Church of England?" "Marry," quoth my Lord Archbishop, "Christ is Head of this member as He is of the whole body of the Universal Church." "Why," quoth Dr. Martin, "you made King Henry supreme head of the Church." "Yes," said Cranmer, "of all the people of England, as well ecclesiastical as temporal." "And not of the Church," quoth Dr. Martin. "No," said the Archbishop, "for Christ is the Head of His Church and of the faith and of the religion of the same; the King is head and governer of all his people, which are the visible Church. There was never other thing meant."

So you see that the distinction of Church and Establishment was clearly maintained.

Again, in our own history the Establishment was completely suppressed, or rather made to take the form of the "Independent" worship, during the great Rebellion; and the Church was persecuted!

But the Church continued to exist, and shone out with greater vigour during the succeeding reigns of the Stuart dynasty.

It is true that during the miserable days of the Georgian era the Church, with her synods suppressed and her worldly-minded Bishops, became so practically Erastianised as to appear for a time to be very much the same as the political establishment. But immediately that, by God's mercy, the spiritual revival began the differences between the Church and the Establishment became again more and more apparent.

In its judicial proceedings the State is forcing an interpretation on its religious formularies so as to make them more or less opposed in meaning while remaining the same in words to the formularies of the Church of England; but, whatever else it may do, this action goes directly to enforce the distinction between the Church and the Establishment.

Allow me to give a few illustrations. By the Gorham Judgment, 8th of March, 1850, the State Court relaxed for the established religion the interpretation of the stringent baptismal teaching of the Office common to both the State and the Church.

It is true this judgment has not been reversed, but the Church was not made thereby herctical. Her meaning of her own formularies as binding on herself was not affected by the new meaning imposed on the words by the State for the Establishment, while as a direct outcome of the State's action the Catholic doctrine was received for the first time by thousands, and the Church *began* to obtain her synodal action after a stupor of 150 years.

Again, the judgment on *Essays and Reviews* made no difference in the doctrine of the Church, while the book was shortly afterwards condemned by the Church in her synod.

The ecclesiastical jurisdiction proper, which inheres in the Church, and is dependent on no temporal authority, remains now as ever in the persons of her Bishops as conferred by consecration, and is exercised by the Bishops either alone or with the council of the priesthood in the diocesan or larger synod. The deposition and excommunication of Dr. Colenso is the most notable recent instance of the exercise of this true ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the Anglican communion.

And this, entirely independent of and in opposition to the authority of the State, which, to the present day, maintains the Dr. in possession of the temporalities.

Again, in her marriage laws the State is drifting further from the Church. The passing of the Divorce Acts has made no difference in the law of the Church as to the indissolubility of marriage—a fact the operation of which on the conscience of the clergy is so far recognised by the State as to induce her to relieve the clergy from the obligation of marrying the guilty parties, although they are bound to yield up their church for the purpose to any other cleric that will.

In the case of our disestablished Churches, whether in Ireland or in the Colonies, the State has distinctly recognised their continuous existence and their uninterrupted spiritual power.

Here are some clear indications not only of the fact of the distinction of the Church from the Establishment during all periods of her history, but of the distinct recognition of the fact by our temporal rulers, as shown by the tendency of recent legislation.

I have dwelt thus long upon this distinction between the Church and the Establishment, for it is a very essential point in the consideration of the relations of the Church to the Crown.

1. Because as long as we recognise this inherent power in the Church, we need not be so absurdly nervous of any damage coming to her through the aggression of the temporal power.

2. Because when carefully considered many of these so-called aggressions are not really such at all, but the exercise of the State's necessary rights in respect to the Establishment.

The Emperor and State rulers took pleasure in conferring on the clergy, especially the Bishops, secular honours of various kinds—they became gradually endowed with many temperal privileges, and were gifted with jurisdiction in many causes of civil cognisance, and were not uncommonly employed in the transaction of important secular affairs. Now all these honours, as coming from the State, were held subject to the conditions imposed by the State, and any interference with these functions, though *called* ecclesiastical, does not necessarily effect the *true* ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Church which is inherent in the Episcopal office and order.

Again, we must remember that laws about Bishops, Divine service, rites and ceremonies, and the like, to which we may add dogmas of the Christian faith, might under the existing relations of the Church and the Empire be either ecclesiastical or civil in their character and therefore in their authority.

For all these things have a place in a State religion, for which reason all these things so far, *and so far only as they* had relation to the State religion, were parts of State law and under the legislative and judicial cognisance of the State.

Let me illustrate this by a reference to the difficult question as to the appointment of Bishops by the Crown.

The Church's position is impregnable. The State may nominate 1,000 Bishops: the Church only can *make* one. It is absurd to talk of compulsion. If Bishops won't consecrate improper men, they can't be made Bishops at all. On the other hand, there is no necessity for the Church to refuse to consecrate men *not unfit* on the ground either that better men might be found, or that they are State nominees; and we must not forget that, so long as the Bishops are the great temporal chiefs they are, the Crown (that is the supreme civil power) must have a voice, and a consentient voice, in their appointment.

I am fully sensible of the advantages both to the Christian religion and to the cause of good government arising from the union of Church and State.

But the only chance of maintaining that union is a due recognition on the part of each of their distinctive authorities and powers.

The *independent* power of the Church must be purely spiritual in its nature and authority, for all that is temporal and political must necessarily be inferior and subject to that power which in these matters is rightly supreme. On the other hand, the limit of the Church's influence on the well-being of the people is the supply of individual life and zeal that is within her, and it will be wise for the State to foster that life by giving great liberty under due episcopal control for fresh services and organisations, without seeking for them the authority of law, and to avoid driving that zeal into excesses by a careful consideration for those high susceptibilities by which true zeal is so frequently accompanied.

Mr. S. Leighton, M.P.'s, paper dealt with "The Church and Parliament," dwelling on the inconveniences of Parliamentary government of the Church of England, which was now preparing to deprive the Churchmen of England of all the property which belonged to their Church. Such relations were tolerable when all Parliament men were Churchmen, but they must now be modified when Parliament men were not only not Churchmen, but when some of them had engaged to do all they could to destroy the Church of England. With respect to the claim that the endowments of the Church did not belong to the Church, but to the nation, Parliament would deal with them according to the will of the majority, for the power of the State might deprive any body of men of their worldly goods. Force was now the only ultimate argument, and the only effective answer was for the 75 per cent. of Englishmen who were Churchmen to vote that they will not allow their Church to be robbed. They lived in days when confiscation was a fashionable form of government, and a majority in Parliament condoned everything. The unity of all Churchmen was their only hope. It was absolutely necessary to their interests that they should devise some scheme for dealing with Church affairs, and provide a majority of the House of Commons, so that it might become law, for the relations of Church and Parliament were fast becoming intolerable.

Mr. Cecil Raikes, M.P., followed with a lengthened address, in the course of which he said:—I would ask the question here, is the Church resolute in holding her own—are Churchmen as vigorous and as earnest as they ought to be in maintaining those privileges and advantages which she possesses? We know they are not. That spirit which Mr. Leighton has adverted to largely prevails. Churchmen consider more the bone of contention between themselves than the question of maintaining the Church of England in that position which she enjoys in this country. They believe that she is so good, that her mission is so divine, that she has in her the means of influencing the minds of men, that they need not exert themselves, and they allow some one else to go and do the work, and stay at home themselves and look after their own particular crotchets. That is not the spirit. (Cheers.) The Church must not be abandoned. (Cheers.) She would not be a branch of the Apostolic Church if she was stripped of all her influence, and that generation would incur great responsibility if by carelessness or indifference or any personal controversy, it allowed those enormous advantages possessed by the Church which have come down to us through the munificence of the past ages, which are the means of evangelising the poorer brethren around us and enabling the Church to perform those great duties imposed on her by the highest source, to be taken away from her. (Cheers.) And I think we should not forget that if the endowments of the Church are to be taken from her you will strike such a blow against endowments in the future as will make it impossible for her to recover from the ruin which will have been caused in an unguarded moment. (Cheers.) People will not endow again if they see the Church stripped of what their fathers gave her. I do not shrink from fighting the battle of the Church, as far as her temporalities are concerned, in Parliament. (Cheers.) I believe the Church will hold her own in Parliament, and I call upon this meeting to testify in an unmistakeable manner that we as Englishmen are determined that the Church of England, so long at least as we have one arm left to uphold her, shall continue to flourish in all the strength and all the beauty which she has acquired in the many centuries she has dwelt among us. (Cheers.)

At the morning meeting in the Temperance Hall, the subject discussed was "The Clergy." The Rev. G. Greenwood read the following paper:—

ON THE APPOINTMENT OF BISHOPS AND PARISH PRIESTS.

It may be hoped that the time is within measurable distance when Bishops in diocesan synods, comprising representatives of the laity as well as the clergy, will make rules for the management of their dioceses, which all Churchmen will feel bound in conscience to obey; and when, sitting in diocesan courts having true spiritual authority, and so constituted as to possess the confidence of the clergy and laity of the dioceses, they will visit violations of the Church's laws with spiritual penalties, which all good Churchmen will gladly take their part in enforcing. But if the day is coming when the Bishops will thus resume the exercise of spiritual powers, which have been too long in abeyance, it is obvious that the question of the method by which men are to be chosen to hold the Episcopal office is one of ever-growing interest. The present system, whatever be its practical success, can hardly be considered satisfactory as applied to a state of things in which the Bishop is regarded not merely as an authority recognised and supported by the State, but also and chiefly as Christ's representative in the government of His Church, deriving from Him powers which no State can give, and which—although it may hinder and hamper the exercise of them by persecution—no State can take away. I propose, then, in this paper, to inquire whether a method can be found, not necessitating the separation of the Church from the State, and not requiring changes too great or too sudden, by which primitive principles in regard to the appointment of Bishops may be adapted to the actual condition of the English Church, and a matter so vital as the selection of the Church's spiritual rulers may no longer be left to the discretion of one man, and that man not even necessarily himself a Churchman.

And first, it must, I think, be allowed that there is no Divinely appointed method of choosing men for the Episcopal office. Before, however, the middle of the third century—the Church being already divided into Provinces, each with its own Metropolitan—the rule had become established, which was sanctioned by the great Council of Nicæa,* that the nomination should be made by the clergy and laity of the vacant diocese, and be confirmed by the Metropolitan with his provincial synods who under normal circumstances, as being the consecrators of the new Bishop, most always have had a veto on the appointment. This method, if any, has a claim to be regarded as the Church's accepted mode of selection; yet it lasted in its integrity but for a comparatively short period. From the time when Christianity became the established religion of the Roman Empire, and the Bishops of the Church were recognised—unfortunately, as we may now perhaps be disposed to think—as authorities in the State, the Emperor and the great State officers in the provinces under him began naturally to desire to have a voice in the selection of Bishops, and could hardly fail, when so minded, to make their influence felt. But it was the joint action of the Papacy, and the strong, rude, yet often highly-gifted, Teutonic leaders who partitioned the Western Empire, and became, after a while, converts to Christianity, that finally overthrew the Church's entire system. Choice by the head of the State, and ratification by the Pope, became the recognised method of appointing Bishops in the West. Apparently, as long as the union between Church and State subsists, it would not be either possible or desirable to do away with the action of the latter in the appointment of Bishops which thus became established in the Middle Ages, and was not essentially affected by the Reformation. Yet it is interesting to observe how, in the process which at the latter date was arranged here in England, traces of the Church's earlier method were preserved, affording suggestions, and as it were starting-points, for the modifications which have now become desirable. The form of choice by the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral of an accupant for the vacant See, unreal though it be, represents by a survival the voice of the diocese in the appointment of its spiritual ruler; while the confirmation by the Archbishop may be regarded as a remnant of the ratification by the provincial synod of the selection made by the diocese.

But what was the natural—one might almost say the inevitable—principle that underlay the primitive method of appointment? Surely it was this—that each of the parties chiefly interested in the character and conduct of the Bishop to be elected should concur in his election. Originally those parties were twofold—viz., the clergy and laity whom he was to govern, and the Metropolitan and comprovincial Bishops of the Province, who were the local representatives of the universal episcopate, by some of whom he would be consecrated, and in whose synod he would have a seat—therefore, by their concurrent action the election was effected. But when the Bishops of the Church became judges armed with authority by the State, and subsequently Peers of the realm, the Christian Emperor, King, or feudal head of the State, had a great interest in their views and administration, and by the foregoing principle might fairly claim a share in their appointment. The evil was that his position enabled him gradually to reduce the share of the other parties to a nullity, and virtually to keep the nomination in his own hands, and that, alas! the worldly interests of the Church bribed her rulers to offer no effectual opposition to this encroachment. But, if this is a true account of the situation, a remedy for present difficulties must be sought in a rearrangement which would keep in view the principle of allowing a share in the appointment of Bishops to all those who were mainly interested in their administration. Who, then, are they who at the present time should, according to this rule, have a voice in the selectien of a Bishop? They may, I think, be thus enumerated—the clergy and laity of the diocese over which he is to preside; the Dean and Chapter of his Cathedral, who should be his council and his most effective coadjutors; the Metropolitan and the Comprovincial Bishops, in whose synod he will have a seat; and, lastly, the Sovereign of the Realm of which he will be a Peer. There seems to be no difficulty in settling the form in which two of these parties should take action; the Sovereign would act, as at present, through the Prime Minister; the Metropolitan and the Comprovincial Bishop in the Convocation of the Province—an arrangement which, as our Convocations are constituted, would have the advantage of giving the representatives of the clergy of the Province some voice in the selection. The mode in which the other parties concerned—viz., the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral and the clergy and laity of the diocese—might take part in the election requires a little further consideration. If the present nugatory action of the Dean and Chapter is, as has been suggested, a last relic of the part which the diocese originally played in the choice of its spiritual ruler, it seems to follow that, while on the one hand—both from the fact of its present important though anomalous position in regard to this matter, and from the close relations which should subsist between it and the Bishop—the claim of the Cathedral Chapter to have a share in selecting an occupant for the vacant See can hardly be disregarded; on the other hand, it should act no longer separately, but as an integral part of the diocese. How, then, should the diocese, as a whole, be represented for the purpose of choosing its new spiritual ruler? Surely in the way in which it should be represented for all Church purposes which require for their carrying out the concurrence of all the Churchmen of the diocese—viz., by a diocesan synod or conference. In a paper which I had the privilege of reading to the Church Congress at Swansea, I urged the advantage, and almost the necessity, of establishing in every diocese a synod with whose advice and concurrence the Bishop should regulate the more important matters affecting the spiritual interests of his people. And in order to avoid the complexity, the waste of time, and the possibility of collision, which must result from the co-existence of two separate bodies—a synod consisting of the Bishop and the representatives of the clergy, and a conference consisting of the Bishop, the representatives of the clergy, and the representatives of the communicant laity, I advocated the admission of the latter into the synod itself; not, as a matter of right—for that I felt sure, if Scripture and primitive custom were to decide the question, could not be admitted—but as a concession which the Bishop and clergy might, I believed, rightfully, safely, and wisely make in the present condition of the Church. I endeavoured to show that, for the purpose of keeping the three parties in their legitimate spiritual relations, the synod should be arranged in three Houses, of which the Bishop himself should be the first, the representatives of the clergy the second, and those of the laity the third; and that no synodical act should be promulgated without the concurrence of all three—of the Bishop as ordaining, the clergy as confirming, and laity as assenting. Supposing such a synod as this to be constituted in any diocese, it would be through it that the diocese would naturally act in the selection of its chief pastor; but if such an arrangement as that for which I pleaded be considered inadmissible, then it cannot, I think, be doubted that—in accordance with primitive principles—the voice of the diocese in the choice of its Bishop must be allowed to make itself heard by means of a conference in which the communicant laity of the Church shall be duly represented; for there can be no question of the original right of the laity to take part in the election. In either case—whether the diocese act through a diocesan synod containing lay representatives, or through a conference—it becomes easy to assign a proper position to the Dean and Chapter in its counsels. Under ordinary circumstances they would, I presume, be *ex-officio* members of the second House of the synod—of which indeed the Dean might very well be the chairman, when it decides to deliberate separately—or *ex-officio* members of the conference. But in the vacancy of a See, the Dean and Chapter, for certain purposes of a demonstration, discharge the functions of the Bishop; and they would naturally take his place as forming the first House of the synod, or as presiding over the confererence. Thus, while ceasing to act, as now, apart from the diocese, they would occupy a position of real influence in the selection of its spiritual ruler, which would more than compensate for the loss of their present elusive privilege.

So far there has been a natural evolution of the application of the principle with which we started—that of giving all the parties chiefly interested a share in the appointment of a Bishop. But now, having got the different factors of the problem—the diocesan synod or conference with the Dean and Chapter at its head, the Convocation of the Province presided over by the Metropolitan, and the Sovereign represented by the Prime Minister—in what precise manner shall we set them to co-operate in bringing out the required result? One step further towards the solution may be taken without much question: as long as the union between Church and State continues, the final choice of a successor to a vacant See will, I think, remain with the Crown; and from this it follows that the action of the other parties concerned can only take the form of a nomination of several persons from among whom the final choice shall be made, or of some right of challenge as regards the names selected by the Sovereign. Probably there is an almost endless variety of ways in which one or both of these powers might be conferred upon the Convocation of the Province and the representatives of the diocese; and in suggesting a particular plan I must be understood as offering it rather as an illustration than as a proposal likely to win at once any general acceptance. Upon the death or resignation of a Bishop, a modified form of *congé d'élire* might be sent to the Metropolitan and to the Dean authorising them to assemble respectively the Convocation of the Province and the synod or conference of the diocese, for the purpose of selecting and submitting to the Crown the names of not more than six persons well qualified to fill the vacant office. The actual mode of selection might be as follows—the synod or conference might agree upon not more than three names, which should then be sent to the Metropolitan. The Convocation might add to these, if it saw fit, not more than three other names, and the whole list should then be submitted to the Crown. Supposing that the names thus sent up did not exceed three, the Crown might, if it chose, proceed at once to make from among these the final selection: but in any other case—and in this case also, if it saw fit—the Crown might add three names to the list, and then refer it back to the Metropolitan and the Dean, with a permission to the Convocation and the diocese to challenge the names, for the purpose of reducing the number. The synod or conference might then strike out not more names than it had originally selected—*e.g.*, three—if it had exercised its full right of choice, and chose to exercise its full right of challenge, and send the remainder to the Metropolitan. The Convocation in like manner might, if it saw fit, strike out not more names than it had originally added, and the Archbishop would then submit the residue—consisting, if the right of challenge had been fully used, of three names—to the Crown for the exercise of its prerogative of final selection. This process seems complicated in description, but in practice I believe it would prove to be very simple, and one which might be got through in the course of a week. It seems almost theoretically perfect; but possibly, on this very account, it may not commend itself to practical men. I would, however, point out that the value of the general principle which I have advocated is not affected by the rejection of this particular scheme, and I trust that no objections which may be raised against the latter will be allowed to prejudice the consideration of the former. Let me repeat that the main point is that the Churchmen of the vacant diocese and the Bishops of the Province should have an effective voice in the appointment of the new Bishop; with the subsidiary suggestion that apparently their action must take the form either of recommendation or of challenge, or of some combination of oath. It only remains to point out the advantages which may be expected to arise from the adoption of this principle, whether in the form I have proposed or in any other suitable manner.

---

* See Conc. Nic., Can. 4, compared with the Epistle of the Council to the Churches in Egypt given in Socrates, Book I., c. 9.

And here let me guard against the idea that we are likely, by any alteration in the method of appointment, to get better or abler men for Bishops than we have at present. I venture to affirm that those who have been chosen to occupy that position here in England during the last thirty years, will on the average compare favourably with any average set of Bishops in Christendom, of whatever time or country, and that more than one of them would have stood out pre-eminent either for holiness or for administrative power in any era or region of the Church. But it is none the less true that the course of a man, when appointed to an office, may be greatly influenced by the circumstances under which the appointment has been obtained; and I trust that I shall not appear to be saying anything offensive or disrespectful if I suggest that not only the conduct of our Bishops, but still more the conduct of others towards them, has sometimes been unfavourably affected by a sense that they have been selected solely by the favour of the Crown. The benefits, then, which may fairly be looked for from the adoption of the principles which I have advocated are briefly these:—

1. From the variety of the parties who would be concerned in the election, there would be a better chance than now of every sort of man who had any real fitness for the office being proposed for it.

2. From the same cause, there would hardly arise a suspicion of anyone laying himself out for a bishopric. The suffrages to be gained would be too diverse, and the chances too incalculable to make it worth anybody's while to seek to turn them in his own favour by any other method than that of simply doing his duty to the best of his ability.

3. There could be no suspicion of anyone having been chosen mainly on political grounds.

4. There could be no such claim, and no such sense, of obligation to a particular person, or set of persons, as may conceivably hamper or trouble one who is appointed to a bishopric by the present system.

5. And, lastly, the Churchmen of a diocese would feel an interest, and, as it were a property, in their Bishop, and, therefore, a readiness to listen to him and co-operate with him in a way which is hardly possible at present. For even if he were not one of their own nominees, he would be one whom, by not desiring to challenge his name, they had virtually accepted; so that the ancient rule would be observed, that no Bishop should be assigned to an orthodox diocese whom the people were unwilling to receive.

I have left myself scant time for speaking of the second topic allotted to me—the question of the appointment of parish priests. This subject is so delicate and complicated that it could only be rightly treated in a paper entirely devoted to it. I will, however, state very briefly the principles which, it seems to me, should regulate the matter.

In the first place, a remedy for abuses is not to be sought in the abolition of those rights of patronage which were secured to founders, donors, and benefactors by canons of early Councils of the Church;* the placing of restrictions upon the sale of those rights is all that can be wisely done in this direction. On the other hand, I trust that the idea of allowing the parishioners, or even the communicants, to choose their own priest will never be entertained: experience proves that this is perhaps the most demoralising system both to priest and people that can possibly be devised. The true theory of the position of a parish priest is, that he is the representative of the Bishop, deriving his mission or jurisdiction from him, and exercising it in subordination to him, although not removable by him except for good cause and by a formal process. It follows from this that, where the Bishop is not the patron, he should have greater power than at present of refusing to constitute a priest whom he deems to be unfit for a benefice to which he has been presented. Yet such a power as this would have to be carefully guarded, lest it should be used to destroy the rights of a patron, or to limit unduly the range of permissible doctrine or ritual in the diocese. Probably it would be necessary to lay down certain definite grounds of refusal, such as heresy, immorality, insufficient learning, or insufficient or unsuccessful experience; and the patron should have the right of appeal to a properly constituted provincial court, should the Bishop fail to convince him that his objections to his nominee were sound and forcible.

It is more difficult to define the mode of action which might be allowed to the Churchmen of a parish or district, when an appointment was made against which they felt bound to remonstrate. That much may perhaps be safely determined; that such actions should be confined to the male communicants of above a certain age, and should take the form of their selecting two of their number to confer with the Bishop and explain to him their difficulties. It might be made incumbent upon him to consider carefully their allegations, and in case he was not himself the patron, either to disallow and try to remove their objections, or, if satisfied of their validity, to refuse to institute the priest presented, leaving the patron to appeal, if he thought fit, to the Provincial Court. In cases where the Bishop was the patron, it might be made his duty—if he failed to satisfy the complainants—to refer the matter, should they request him to do so, to the Provincial Court, the decisions of which should in all cases be final. This seems to point to an amicable conference between the Bishop, the representatives of the communicants, and the patron—if the benefice was not in the gift of the Bishop—before a formal appointment was made; and it may be hoped that in all but a very few cases such a conference would lead to an arrangement that could be accepted by all parties.

Dr. W. G. F. **PHILLIMORE** contended that the present system of the application of Bishops was bad, and in these days of representative government it was strange that there should be no representative body having power in this matter. In the earlier days of the Church neither clergy nor people had a Bishop forced upon them. When it was formally worked out the nomination was made by the clergy and people, and the synod, if they approved, appointed him. This rule was laid down by the old Church laws, but in time the Emperor became a great power in the Church, and took the power out of the hands of the laity. What the Emperor claimed for himself, smaller potentates also claimed, and the Dean and Chapter represented the clergy, and the Emperor claimed to represent the laity. He did not agree that we always got the best Bishops under the present system. But were it the best men were appointed, were they appointed in the best way. A Bishop came as a stranger till he had made himself a friend, and the Bishop sometimes thought that he came as one from without to put matters right with the diocese. The appointment by the State encouraged Erastianism and prelacy. If they got good men, it was owing to public opinion controlling the appointments. Would anyone say that the Bishops of the Georgian era were always appointed from the best motives, and this was the case where public opinion had little or no effect. The Prime Minister of the future might be a Dissenter, or even an unbeliever. What security had they that he would not pick out a most objectionable man as a Bishop? At the time of the Reformation the Sovereign had a greater power in the Church. Even as late as George III., Bishops were sometimes appointed by the King after consulting with the Bishops, and with scant reference to the Prime Minister. That was better than the present system, when the Bishops were appointed by the Prime Minister, who was the nominee of a Parliament composed of persons not necessarily members of the Church of England. He proposed not to alter the relations of Church and State, not to deprive the State of its voice in the appointment of Bishops, but to give the Church a voice, which could be granted without infringing on the present relations of Church and State.

The Rev. C. J. **THOMPSON** thought that if the voice of the Church were heard in the appointment of Bishops there would be more Bishops than at present, and that was what was specially needed. He did not wonder that a Bishop should have a very large stipend, and he thought that many who were situated like him with a population of 20,000, and some six or seven clergymen, and no end of laymen to work on a stipend of £200, would agree with him. He thought, however, that they could not have, on the average, a better body of Bishops than they had, but it seemed to him that the ordinary Bishop lost touch with his Church and touch with his people. He thought that when a clergyman lived among his people and with them, a Bishop might live in much the same way, and by doing so do much to bring in the masses to the bosom of the Mother Church. He believed if they had a more popular basis for the appointment of Bishops they would have men more loyal to the church order, and more loyal to their clergy. He alluded to the fact that a Bishop on an Ember Sunday, when he should have been ordaining priests and deacons, should have taken the opportunity of going into the chapel of another body which represented their order. (Loud applause, and cries of "Question.")

The Rev. Dr. **WIRGMAN** said in the Church of South Africa they had elected their own Bishops, and the communicant laity had a distinct voice. Every priest, whether beneficed or not, had a vote, each congregation had a meeting and elected a representative. The Bishop had to be chosen by two-thirds of either party, and the clergy could not elect a Bishop in opposition to the laity, nor the laity in opposition to the clergy. He thought the support which the late Bishop Merriman received was due to the fact that he was elected by the clergy and laity. The diocese of Grahamstown was now about to elect another Bishop, and he might say they did not feel any anxiety as to the result. They felt that the new Bishop, whoever he might be, being appointed in a constitutional way, they would look on him as their legimately elected father in God. If the result of the plan in South Africa should help the clergy and laity here to their just rights he should not have spoken in vain.

The Rev. W. L. **BLACKLEY**—

A paper on the "Position and Prospects of Unbeneficed Clergy" may be stated in different but equivalent terms as treating of "Curates' disadvantages and their possible removal."

"I speak of curates' *disadvantages*, for I object to the word *grievance* in this connection at all. No man has any *grievance* properly so-called, against a profession, unless it have either compelled him to enter it or broken some preliminary engagement it may have made with him to induce his entering upon it. This the Church of England cannot be shown to have done with her curates. Therefore they have no *grievance*. But they certainly labour under great disadvantages. The object of the Curates' Alliance is to remedy these disadvantages. Their aim at least ought to command the sympathy of all Churchmen of all classes, and I sympathise myself most cordially with that aim. But, since (as I have had occasion to show in an article in the April *Church Quarterly Review*) I find among the remedies they suggest for their disadvantages not one that seems to me a practical proposal, I am bound, though sympathising with their aims, to dissent from their methods.

"They have, however, done good service—firstly, in drawing attention to certain difficulties as indicating directions in which remedies may be sought which no one blames them for not yet finding; and secondly, in showing to the more thoughtful men among their own number, how much more difficult it is to complain than to cure, and thus prevent their feeling too sanguine of immediate advantages from the present agitation.

"However sympathising with the aim of the Alliance, there is one part of their action which I should not be dealing frankly to pass over here without an honest expression of opinion. Whether all sales of all advowsons can be abolished or no by obstructing sales by auction only; whether the good cause be advanced or no by the systematic public chaffing of importunate auctioneers; whether the grave character of that Christian ministry, whose members "must not strive," suffer or no by the violent evictions from salerooms of clergy whose last idea in entering was to become purchasers; these are matters of taste and opinion which I will not presume either to discuss or decide. But if, as I quite readily believe, it be a feeling of conscientious duty which prompts generous-minded young men to such courses, I must point out, as a matter of simple logic, a consequence which this conduct involves. Its justification is based on the assumption that every sale of an advowson must be, and must have been, a corrupt and sinful thing in itself. If the root be corrupt the branches must be corrupt; and, as every advowson in private hands has been, or must be, at one time or another, sold and bought, every holder of this opinion is logically bound to refuse partaking of other men's sins by accepting any living offered by a private patron. The general carrying out of this logical duty would absolutely abolish the sale of advowsons, and is in the power of the curates to accomplish. That they should agree to use this power is perhaps too much to ask of poor human nature.

"Though I will not further allude to the controversy which the Curates' Alliance has aroused, or criticise one by one its proposals, I must still, in the interest of brotherly Christian feeling, enter a word of quiet protest against the common, but really fallacious assumption, that the supposed grievances of the unbeneficed clergy, as a class, are due to any jealousy or hostility, as a class, of the beneficed. That there may be tyrannical or disagreeable individuals among the incumbents will be as frankly admitted as that there may be useless or impracticable individuals among the curates. But the two classes are the same men in everything but circumstance, while their being the same, even in this, is for the most part a question of time. All have been curates, all are quite willing to become incumbents. A vast number of the beneficed men can show at least as hard experience as the great majority of the unbeneficed who now lift up their voices; and I may be pardoned for stating, in proof of my claim to cordially sympathise with any proven grievance of the curates, that before receiving my present benefice I laboured myself thirteen years as a curate, in one post, on a clerical income of less than £100 a-year, without a house. My particular business, however, to-day, is to take up several of the points shown, not only by the promoters of the Curates' Alliance, but by those of the Curates' Augmentation Fund, to operate to the great disadvantage not only of the unbeneficed clergy, but also of the true Church interests of our people, and to propound a suggestion of my own, by which I am led to believe a considerable amelioration may, in course of time, be affected as regards these special points.

"At the present time the services of a great number of otherwise most suitable men are lost to the Church of England, both by unwillingness to enter the profession at all, in view of its many disadvantages, and by its abandonment, after entrance, from the following causes:—

"1. The progressive diminution of income obtainable by an unbeneficed man, however active, as he grows older, caused by the natural unwillingness of incumbents to employ gentlemen senior to themselves in subordinate positions. 2. The uncertainty of an elderly or aged clergyman, if unbeneficed, being able to obtain the means of existence. 3. The stagnation of promotion to independent posts, caused by the inability of aged and infirm incumbents to afford the resignation of their benefices. 4. The uncertainty of a curate obtaining any independent post at all. 5. The long average time (twelve years) before the promotion of each curate who obtains such a post. 6. The exceptional length of time, as compared with all other professions, during which a young man must remain a burden and expense to his friends before being able to earn his own living.

"These six principal reasons keep numbers of excellent men out of the ministry, while necessarily causing, among those who do enter it, and fail of obtaining promotion, discontent, heartburnings, and disappointments, all the greater because, hitherto at least, beyond all reach of practical remedy.

"The present proposal aims at correcting all these distressing conditions, and is based on the following hypothesis:—If every clergyman hereafter to be ordained could, at sixty years of age, claim a pension of £100 a year, on the one condition of his not holding a benefice, difficulties No. 1 and No. 2 would at once disappear. On reaching the pension age the unbeneficed man's income would be largely increased, instead of diminishing, and means of existence would never be in doubt.

"Difficulty 3, the slowness of resignations would be largely and sufficiently diminished, for it would become the interest of all vigorous incumbents of livings up to £100 a year, and of all infirm ones (now obliged to employ curates) of livings up to £350 a year, to resign their benefices at sixty years of age. Each of the latter must pay a curate on the average £130 out of his £350, leaving him only £220 for himself; while, by retiring, he might have the third part of his living—say £116—with his pension of £100, together £216; practically as much as he could obtain by clinging to his living, and keeping another man for years in a subordinate post. Now, as far more than two-thirds of all the livings in England are below £350 a year in value (there being 8,752 under £300 as against 4,548 above £300), it is plain that, not reckoning the effect of the pension on stimulating retirement from the larger livings, the resignation at a much earlier age than now of more than two livings in every three would largely multiply the independent posts available for curates, and fairly extinguish the difficulty No. 3.

"Difficulty No. 4 would also be very largely corrected, the uncertainty of promotion to an independent post being diminished by the great increase in the number of such posts available; and Difficult No. 5 would be equally corrected, since the average length of probation would be greatly shortened, possibly indeed from twelve years, as at present, down to six or five. The remedy for No. 6 will appear further on.

"The next question is, how to realise the hypothesis.

"The only conceivable certain way is by insurance—by an insurance effected on safe terms by the clergy henceforth to be ordained themselves. I should scorn to propose any other scheme than an absolutely independent one. Anything in any way depending on doles, donations, contributions, collections, charity, must be both demoralising and precarious. It is pauperisation in the beginning, degradation in the course, and probable bankruptcy at the close of working life. Such an insurance as I propose must trust to no alms or gifts or subscriptions, and it must, instead of being contributed periodically, and therefore precariously, be paid up in one sum at the commencement of professional life. A very small sum indeed will secure this insurance of £100 pension under the conditions named.

"The cost (at a 4 per cent. investment) of an insurance effected at ordination for £100 a year pension, claimable at 60, without any conditions, is, by the Carlisle table, £132. If all the clergy made such a payment, with the condition that only unbeneficed men should receive pension, it is plain that if there be, roughly speaking, twice as many beneficed as there are unbeneficed clergy, only one-third could be at one time in receipt of pension, and that a general contribution of a third of the £132—that of £44—would secure the desired object. For absolute security let the sum be placed at £50. This small payment made by each man at ordination would work all the important remedies for want of which the Church is languishing.

"But how is it to be got from every man in future to be ordained?

"To make the payment compulsory would be to check the supply of candidates for Orders. It cannot be compelled, and I do not propose it. *But it may be induced.* It may be made the plain interest of every candidate for holy orders to secure the pension before ordination. How? By the Bishops of the Church, for the Church's own good, taking measures for admitting candidates by faculty into the diaconate (not into the priesthood) a year earlier than at present, on the condition of their being provided with the suggested policy of insurance. This would correct Difficulty 6, the lateness of ordination, to the great advantage of all parties concerned.

"But how would such a measure provide the £50 for each candidate? In the simplest way. At the present time the candidate must live without professional earnings during his twenty-third year; but if ordained deacon at twenty-two, instead of being, as at present, a burden to his friends during that year, he will be well able to support himself. If his friends paid the £50 for the insurance, they would be no worse off than now; and he would be provided with a secure pension for old age, if unsuccessful in procuring preferment in the Church. But even did his friends not provide the £50, he might do it himself out of his first or first two years' earnings. And therefore the best form of carrying out the proposal would be to make the faculty for earlier ordination depend on the incumbent who gives the nomination binding himself to deduct the amount required for the insurance by instalments from the stipend earned in the two years' diaconate; the passing on of the deacon to priest's orders at the end of that time being dependent, in the Bishop's discretion, on the due fulfilment of the condition undertaken. His earnings during his first two years will be about £250; which, deducting the cost of insurance, would leave him £200 to live on during his twenty-third and twenty-fourth years. This direct advantage, working with the other advantage of giving a year's additional clerical standing, would almost infallibly induce all candidates for orders to make the suggested provision.

"The possibility of passing an Act for this purpose may be disputed. But, if really and plainly for the Church's good, its chance would be hopeful. No thoughtful man has any right at the present time to check any movement whatever by the assumption that this or that exceptional thing can never be supposed likely to pass into law.

"Lastly, a word as to the machinery to be used. It is ready to our hand in the Curates' Augmentation Fund. If only a law could be passed to sanction for this one beneficent purpose the giving of faculties for ordination to deacon's orders at twenty-two, there being only an average of 600 curates annually ordained, the work of securing the policies would average only twelve transactions a week, or two a day, by a society already provided with an office and a staff. A few pounds a year for correspondence would practically be all the expense involved for the first thirty-eight years while the pension fund accumulated; and not only would that society never be called on to give a farthing to any clergyman over sixty years of age, but the immense reduction in the number of old curates caused by the multiplication of resignations and the shortening of stipendiary service, would fully enable it to carry out its first beneficent intention, and to give to every unbeneficed man of fifteen years' work and standing its full sum of £100 a year, say from thirty-eight years of age to sixty, when he would become entitled to draw the pension provided by himself.

"This proposal is only put forth in the briefest form for general consideration, and the few figures given, though sound, are of course only approximate. I do not enter now and here on objections to the scheme, which, however, so far as I have heard them, are capable of easy answer; I only beg to commend the earnest study of the matter to all incumbents and curates, all Bishops and all Churchmen, who desire to see the removal of difficulties, discouragements, and disadvantages, which, from the fault of neither classes nor individuals, are now besetting the progress of the best Churchwork and disheartening many of the best Church workers."

The Rev. Mr. **LAYMAN** thought the admirable remedy which Mr. Blackley had propounded would improve the position of curates; but it would not be a remedy that spiritual-minded clergymen would desire. It would be an additional advantage, but only an additional one. The only difficulty was the financial one; other difficulties might be got rid of. The only remedy was a change of trustees for the property of the Church. This conveyed no idea of disendowment. It was a fallacy—nay, a falsehood—to say that the Church of England was established. It was an equal fallacy to say it was endowed, as one half of the clergy had no payment fixed at all. The endowments were the endowments of individuals, not of the State, which was the trustee of the endowments. There should be in every diocese a Church Trust for the management of Church property in that diocese, and common sense would give to every worker sufficient to provide for his daily wants.

The Rev. Mr. **HORSLEY** (Under-Secretary of the London Junior Clerical Society) remarked that, walking through the town he had overheard a workman ask another why there were so many parsons about, and the reply was, "I suppose they are on strike." (Laughter.) Well, that was right, they were on strike; they had an end to gain, and they meant to gain it. He advocated the essential equality of the priesthood as opposed to prelacy, but there was one thing quite as bad, and that was "vicary." (Laughter.)

The Rev. Canon **SHUTTLEWORTH** said he was unbeneficed, and a minor Canon, and he thought the grievances of the unbeneficed clergy were nothing as compared to the grievances of a minor Canon. If all heads of Cathedrals were like those under whom he had the honour to serve, there would be no complaint; but he had no position in the diocese, he had no licence from the Bishop, and no vote for the Diocesan Conference of London, and that, he thought, was a grievance. He had no trusts with the Bishop, and that, if not a grievance, was a disadvantage. He defended the action taken by the Curates' Alliance in bringing to the front the claims of the unbeneficed clergymen.

---

* See Conc. Orleans, A.D. 541, Can. 33, and 9th Conc. Toledo, A.D. 655, Can. 2. I am indebted for these references to my friend, Mr. John Walter Lea.

The Rev. Mr. Gedge said he belonged to another section of the unbeneficed clergy, as he was Diocesan Inspector of Schools. He thought the position of curates had much improved since he was ordained, twenty-three years ago. He thought that an unbeneficed clergyman might in many ways help himself, and that curates might do literary or other work in time which was not taken up by their ordinary duties.

The Rev. Mr. Hadden (President of the Curates' Alliance), said he stood in the anomalous position of being a curate without a grievance, his lines having been cast in the City of London, where he received a remuneration which would make many a curate's mouth water. The complaints made by curates generally was not so much that they wanted more pay, but they wanted to do their work in their own way. They claimed a right to celebrate the Holy Communion, and he protested against curates, especially in the West of London, being only allowed to preach to the servant girls in the afternoon. One did not get the best out of a man when he was relegated to these subordinate positions. He considered that the position of curates required amendment, and thought they should be allowed to come forward more than at present.

The Rev. Mr. Cole, vicar of Upton, Somerset, after referring to the various grievances of curates, and the proposed remedies, thought most of the Church difficulties lay with the congregation, who, in a great measure, had the means of remedying many of these grievances. Whatever might befall the Curates' Alliance this meeting would assure it some stability.

The Rev. Theophilus Bennett said that the curates deserved their greatest attention and regard. He looked upon the curates as A 1, and he thought they ought to rally round them. Several gentlemen had announced themselves, and he would announce himself, as a *locum veneus*. When he was ordained he was putting his hand into a lottery bag, and had not drawn a prize. He agreed with all the speakers except Mr. Blackley, who, he thought, was rather a wet blanket. When he was a vicar he always worked well with his curates, as he treated them as gentlemen and trusted them, and this course he wished to impress upon all vicars.

The Rev. Mr. M'Cairan condemned the sale of livings, and thought the verdict of the whole country was against it, and it ought to be opposed by every clergyman. It was a vile scandal, and was keeping thousands of working men out of the Church. He wished to do things by reform, and he saw no difficulty in doing this by means of compensation to private patrons.

The Rev. Mr. Salmon said they had heard of many measures and many remedies, some of them worse than the disease; but one had not been touched upon —viz., how little had been done to increase the endowments of our benefices which would enable incumbents to retire and make preferment easier. He wanted to see some real effort made to enlist the sympathies of the laity to increase the endowments throughout the country.

The proceedings closed by the singing of a hymn and Benediction.

At the afternoon meeting in the Temperance Hall, Mr. T. Salt, M.P., read the subjoined paper:—

THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH TO CANAL POPULATIONS.

The inquiry, What is the duty of the Church towards canal populations touches upon a very large question? It brings us at once face to face with one of the difficulties inherent in the parochial system. Nothing would be more easy than to put forward generally and vaguely, a statement in reply to the inquiry such as few persons could be found ready to dispute. The reply would be as follows:—It is the duty of a great National Church to provide efficiently for the spiritual wants, and, in some degree also, for the bodily necessities of the thousands of poor people who work and move upon the waterways of the country.

But, then, how is this duty to be carried out in the practical details of every.day life? One of the great features of this National Church—some persons would contend the main source of its strength and influence—is to be found in its parochial system. This system is a territorial system. The limits of an ecclesiastical parish are, in most cases, clearly defined. And with respect to a parish the general principle of ecclesiastical law is this; that it is not competent to any clergyman to officiate within the limits of a parish without the consent of the incumbent. It follows, therefore, that a boatman finds himself ecclesiastically in a dilemma. His occupation presumably causes him, with wife and family, to be in constant motion along a river or canal. Hence, on the one hand, he cannot claim the ministrations of each incumbent through whose parish he travels in his course; for such a claim would become an impossible absurdity. Whilst, on the other hand, he may not obtain the assistance of any clergyman from a distance, lest such a person should become amenable to the ecclesiastical law as regards the incumbent of the parish in which he might happen to officiate. It appears, then, that the first duty of the Church in dealing with the canal populations must be to rise superior to the mere technical restrictions of the parochial system. To observe it in its spirit rather than in the letter of the law. For it has been well said, that the aim and end of the parochial system of the Church of England is to provide a fold for every sheep and a shepherd for every fold.

So far we have been speaking chiefly of those boatmen who with their families live upon their boats. There are, however, many whose families live upon shore. The number of these tends to increase. For such cases the parochial difficulty obviously does not arise in the same sense or in an equal degree. Yet there is something to be said even here in favour of a special ecclesiastical arrangement. It is not within the means or the opportunity of every incumbent to provide for a class of people peculiar in their pursuits, their instincts, and their ideas. This fact was well illustrated in papers read at the Church Congress at Stoke in the year 1875, by Canon Barclay and Commander Dawson, upon a subject kindred to our present subject, namely, Churchwork among boatmen. Time will not permit a repetition of the interesting information and suggestions contained in those papers; but perhaps I may venture to say that any person interested should read the discussion of 1875, in connection with the discussion of to-day.

There are, however, some cases in which the organisation of the parochial system may become especially available for the assistance of boat-people. These arise when boats are detained at small wharves or at out-of-the-way places by accident, sickness, or weather. A boat may be delayed by want of water, by repairs of the canal, by failure of a horse. Sudden illness may cause the stoppage of a boat; but this will not often occur, as boat-life is remarkably healthy. It is on the occasion of a long frost in winter that boat-people suffer most, are most in need of a friend, and are most amenable to kindly advice. I speak from practical experience. I am glad to have the opportunity of calling the attention of any clergyman through whose parish a canal passes, and who may chance to hear or to read this paper, to the fact that in winter there may be boat-people detained for many days in his district, grievously in want, and deserving assistance. The boats may be brought to a stand almost suddenly at any point during a hard frost, for they travel as long as it is possible for the horse to drag them through the ice; and the poor people may be out of reach of any help except such as may be found in the immediate neighbourhood. Bread, soup, tea for the boatman and family, hay for the horse (if there is no other source available) would easily be provided by a parochial subscription in money or in kind; and these simple gifts would pave the way for the willing acceptance of advice, instruction, tracts, books, and of special Church services, as opportunity and circumstances might suggest. The remembrance of such acts of friendship would never be effaced; they might exercise a happy influence on the life of many a man and of many a child. They may appear small and humble, but they are not unworthy to be reckoned as one of the duties of a Church whose especial glory it is to be called the Church of the Poor. Besides the parochial system, the subject under discussion touches upon another large and difficult question. I refer to church finance. If, as has been suggested, some special ecclesiastical arrangement should be established for the benefit of canal populations, money must be found. It is clear that the revenues of the parochial clergy will not, and ought not to be made available for this purpose. Much has been done and more may yet be effected by societies supported by voluntary subscription, but these are more or less outside the organisation of the Church, and the question we have to consider is, what is the duty of the Church in this matter. It remains then to devise some plan by which a fund may be created for the use of a diocese, administered by the chief authorities in the diocese, for objects of general utility and importance. There are many purposes for which a diocesan fund is needed, besides the support of clergy to labour amongst the canal populations, but it would be out of place to describe them here. Probably a considerable fund might be raised if the necessity for it were fully explained, and if the method and items of expenditure were efficiently controlled, audited, and published. There might be three sources of income. First, donations and subscriptions from companies and from individuals; secondly, annual collections in each parish of the diocese on a diocesan Sunday, when the work of the diocese might be fully explained and the thoughts of the parishioners raised to a wider sphere of Christian unity and labour; and, thirdly, gifts and bequests by way of endowments; the capital sum being placed in the names of trustees, and the interest being added to the income of the fund. May it not be said that it is the duty of the Church to provide a fund in this or in some other manner —more definite and regular than the casual subscriptions of a few benevolent persons—in order to supply the spiritual wants of the poor on our canals, who may otherwise from their peculiar position be again in the future, as they have been in the past, too much neglected and forgotten?

In considering what is the duty of the Church towards them, something perhaps should be said with regard to the number, the condition, and the character of the canal population. First, as to their number: One of the writers of a paper read at the Church Congress at Stoke in 1875, states as follows:—

"It is calculated that there are some 5,000 miles of rivers and canals in England; and the laborious and useful class of men employed thereon give, with their wives and children, a population of nearly 100,000 souls."

The periodical circulated by the Missions to Seamen Society in the October number of the *Word on the Waters*, for the year 1875, reckons the class of boatmen on canals and rivers at 30,000 men exclusive of women and children. Upon what data these figures are reached I do not know. A Parliamentary return was issued in the year 1879 of the number of canal boats registered under the Canal Boats Act, 1877, and of the total number of persons for the accommodation of whom such boats were registered. It appears from this return that there are 99 registration districts under the Act. Of these 37 did not register any boats—the remaining 62 districts registered 4,964 boats, for the accommodation of 22,206 persons; this gives with sufficient accuracy the number of persons living on board the canal boats. The rest of the boat population live on shore. Of these 22,206 it would be interesting to ascertain the exact proportions of men, women, and children. However, 39 districts only, affecting about one half—namely, 11,062 persons—gave the statistics in detail. Of these 11,062, 6,701 were men, 1,462 women, and 2,899 children. If we apply somewhat the same proportions to the whole number, we arrive, roughly speaking, at the calculation that there are 14,000 men, 3,000 women, and 5,000 children, who habitually dwell on canal boats. The Legislature, by the Canal Boats Act, 1877, has made provision for educational and for sanitary matters. Is it not the duty of the Church to take some special care for their spiritual welfare?

The number of boat-people who have homes on shore very largely exceeds those who live entirely on board their boats. I have just observed that the accommodation provided on registered boats—for boats not used as dwellings are not required to be registered—is stated on authority to be sufficient for 22,000 persons. I have also mentioned the calculation that the total canal population is about 100,000. These estimates are supported and illustrated by a return very kindly furnished to me by the manager of the Leeds and Liverpool Canal. He has sent statistics of persons on board 647 boats plying on the canal. On these boats there were 1,980 persons. Of these 578 were married men, 525 single men or boys above 12; 309 were married women, and 94 single women or girls above 12; 227 were children between 5 and 12; 247 were children under 5 years of age. Of these 1,980 persons, 1,613 or five-sixths had homes on shore; 627 could read, 427 could write. These are instructive details, and suggest the nature of the work that has to be done.

The condition, and the character of the canal people varies in different parts of the country. Some are very poor and very rough; others are respectable and in comfortable circumstances. Much depends upon the employment they can obtain in the locality where they happen to live. More, perhaps, depends upon the education and the habits of the individuals. As a class I believe they are improving, and I can see no reason to suppose that they are less deserving of attention and respect, or less amenable to wholesome teaching and influence than any other labourers in this country. Their mode of life, their work, their number, their days spent sometimes by the wharves of crowded towns—sometimes in the quiet solitude of country journeys—and the want of education in past years, render them possibly difficult to reach and to understand; but all this affords abundant evidence that it is the duty of the Church to make some special effort on their behalf.

During recent years valuable work has been done by the Missions to Seamen Society, by the Lichfield Diocesan Barge Mission, by some of the canal companies, and by individuals; but to enter upon a description of this work in detail does not fall within the terms of the subject proposed for discussion to-day. We have to deal with the general and large question, what is the duty of the Church? Can anyone doubt for a single moment that it is the duty of the Church to devise some means for drawing the canal population within her fold. The work may not be easy, but it is on that account none the less necessary. High ritual, however attractive, historical position, however stately, territorial wealth, however powerful, political influence, however unshaken, will weigh as nothing to promote the true and permanent authority of a Church when compared with the quiet humble patient long-suffering labour of teaching, by which the poor and rich alike are turned towards the virtues of industry, of purity, and of contentment.

If the ordinary Church system is not adapted to meet the case, some special organisation must be created. It has been shown that the parochial system only partially meets the needs of a roving population. Some other area must be applied. The whole country is too large an area for convenient management. The country does not correspond with the ecclesiastical divisions. The areas of the archiepiscopal sees would probably be inconvenient, from their size, and from the absence of any plan of administration to which men are accustomed. The diocese appears to afford all that is required—suitable area, the means of concentrating work, an authority that men will accept and comprehend. Would it be so very difficult for each diocese to create a system under the direct control of the Bishop aided by a small committee of laymen and clergymen that would effectively provide for the persons who are beyond the reach of the incumbent of each parish? The canal people would be found in their own houses, or in their boats travelling on the waterways, or lying for days at a time at certain well-known wharves where they receive and discharge cargo. Here are the opportunities. They must be approached by men specially adapted to the work—men whom they can learn to know, to trust, and to understand. It would be the work of the Committee, under direction of the Bishop, to select such men, and to raise funds for their support. One clergyman with a salary of £250 or £300, assisted by two or three lay-helpers at about £75 each, sometimes moving with the boats, sometimes settled at the most important wharves, would control a large network of canals. The object should be not to separate them from, but to attract the canal people more and more to the parish schools and parish churches. The work would improve with experience. It is a good work, it is not impossible. It is one that may reasonably be reckoned amongst the manifold duties of a powerful, generous, and large-hearted National Church.

At the evening sittings, held in the Temperance Hall, there was a crowded attendance. Sir Lovelace Stamer presided.

The Rev. Gordon Calthrop read the first paper, "Morality in Trade," observing that the Church so endeavoured to place the Saviour before mankind that they might adapt Christian principles to the duties of daily life, and the ministrations of the Church must not be backward in pointing out the defects of our mercantile system. He admitted there were among the mercantile community men of the highest principle, and whose word in every respect was their bond; but that community was a varied one, and many of its members fell short of that standard. All should remember that as Christians they should do everything to the glory of God. He had been told that in great centres of industry, where competition was very keen, men engaged in business found it almost impossible to keep their conscience clear of offence, but he had Scriptural authority for saying that the man who followed the Divine precepts would succeed in life. They must not, however, exalt integrity only as a thing that would pay; but if a man kept himself unspotted from the world his life would be a success in this world, whilst he would have the assurance of future happiness. If the work of the minister was to be properly done they must enter the arena of daily life, and point out and inculcate the great principles of Christian morality and honesty in all the pursuits of this world. Some people thought clergymen were unable to give advice in worldly affairs, but this was not the fact, it being a very great mistake to suppose that a man was "a fool" because he wore a black coat and white tie, and put the word "Rev." before his name; but when they grappled with the work to which he had referred, they must be most careful and circumspect in the way they set about it. They must not draw hard and fast rules, but remember that circumstances altered cases, and they must be impartial alike to the buyer and the seller.

Mr. W. B. Forwood (Liverpool) followed on the same subject. He referred to the great and varied industries of this land, and the intensity of competition, affording a marvellous example of man's integrity to man. There was a well-meant confidence in one man's integrity towards another, and it was due to this in a great measure that the national prosperity was maintained. Speculation was not in itself immoral; indeed it was to the speculation and adventure of our traders that we owe our commercial greatness; but an excess of speculative feeling had a distinctly demoralising influence. It unfitted men for quiet, steady business pursuits, and too frequently its votaries seek the reward which should follow from the exercise of a calm and sound judgment rather than in the "ring," the object of which was to circumvent their brother traders. It was also noticeable that the love of truth was less marked than formerly. Everyone would see this in the vast misrepresentations contained in the invitations issued to the public to subscribe their capital in new undertakings, and which had forced the Legislature to make specific enactments for its protection. The increase of speculative feeling was due to two causes—excessive private expenditure, and the loose, desultory education which so many men of business received, which altogether indisposed them to the continuous mental exertion and labour necessary to achieve success in ordinary business.

The Rev. Prebendary Harry Jones then read the following paper:—

THE CHURCH AND MORALS.

I have no doubt but that some have been perplexed, if not pained, by the title of the subject set before the Congress this evening. Seen in some lights it suggests a division between the Church and Morals, across which one could treat with the other. It looks as if there were two powers, to be counted as independent, between which an alliance is desirable, though not always realised. Surely, however, they cannot be independent. As they are separated they are both maimed or spoiled. A Church without morality is a dead corpse, which may be ecclesiastically galvanised, but is unable to discharge the functions of true spiritual life. And morality severed from the laws of the kingdom of heaven is inconceivable, at least to Christians, after the revelation of that kingdom. Seen in their reality, the Church and Morals are inseparable.

And this truth is conspicuous in respect to politics. Trade and private affairs are only branches and twigs of the political trunk. The relation of the Church to politics, and its influence upon political morality, is of the closest, widest, and most deeply radical sort. It is true that in these days we sometimes hear men speak of the union of Church and State as forced or unnatural, but it is their separation which is unnatural. As they are healthy they must draw their blood from the same heart, and their severance really involves an amputation which cannot be performed without a draining and dismembering of the body to which they belong. Of course, in an unhealthy body, dangerous operations may be necessary; but the highest ideal of Church and State presents them as virtually united, sharing the same principles of action. I do not forget that this ideal is grievously marred by the narrow formulated views taken of the Church and State by some of their friends and enemies. Still we are called to look high and aim high, in all our estimates of and dealings with Church and State; and we must all admit that as the State is pure, as the motives of those who bear rule in it are noble and unselfish, so much the nearer does it resemble a Church whose focal principle is self-sacrifice, and that as the Church is devoted to the following after truth, righteous ministration, and that generous recognition of diversity of spirit which marks Divine guidance and true catholicity, so union with it is more needful to the State. It is only when the Church comes to mean the clergy, and the State the administration, that we can realise their division. It is only as the Church and State are diseased and unlovely that we must talk of their separation. Good couples do not think of divorce. But though every honest man would desire and help to promote such a healthy union as I have spoken of—and more is wrought by suggestive germinating individual effort than this committee-worshipping world knows of—we must look at things as they are, and see what attitude may best be taken by the Church in its corporate capacity and by individual action. In respect to its corporate way, I, for one, venture to think it much to be deplored that the Bishops, who are said to represent the Church in the Legislature, take so small a part as they do in general political questions. By their absence or abstinence, when these are debated, they encourage a belief in the virtual separation of the Church from the State. The best reply to those who deprecate their presence in the Legislature would be supplied by their continuous and obvious usefulness in promoting morality in politics; by the Christian tone given by them to questions of universal interest. Again, I think that more should be attempted by Convocation. That venerable body—be it said with all respect—should strike wider-sounding, deeper notes, and ring fewer ecclesiastical handbells. It would be no despicable contribution to the advancement of political morality if the chief representative body of the Church of this powerful nation were, for instance, to record and widely publish a plea for international arbitration. There are other ways in which it could plead for righteousness as between nations. We are too apt to accentuate the charm of the blessing asked for in the petition, that the course of this world may be so peaceably ordered by God's governance, that His Church may joyfully serve Him in all godly quietness. Might not the Church contribute more to the godly quietness of the world?

I will not dwell over this aspect of corporate Church influence, but, contracting the field of vision, ask you to look with me at the attitude of the individual Churchman in respect to politics. That of the layman, as he is called, need not occupy us long. Though his political interests be sometimes highly coloured by zeal in a passing strain of ecclesiastical legislation, he is expected to have, and takes, great concern in general questions of national policy. No one thinks that he thereby loses caste as a Churchman. And as he is a good member of so large and comprehensive a body as the Church, as he realises what is involved in Church membership, he seeks after righteousness rather than sectarian victory in all his public and private political work.

But it is not altogether thus in respect to the clergyman. A feeling has crept in amongst some that a clergyman had best abstain from what are called politics. They would, perhaps, say that he does well to support morality in trade, as he finds occasion, and certainly to do all that he can to promote it in private affairs. There, some would assert, he works plainly within his limits, but at the risk of his legitimate influence he engages in political strife. It would be difficult to point to a more radically mischievous mistake, or one that according to the measure of its influence, has done the Church and the State more harm. Surely the officer in the kingdom of God should feel the keenest interest in the conduct of the world on its largest lines. Is he to take no concern in the great historical and history-creating moments of a people, and confine himself at most to the crises of a vestry? Is he to content himself with the manipulation of a parish, the culture of a penny bank, the harmony of a choir, and the annotating of a "Speculum Gregis"? Is he thus to sit still in his study, and walk calmly about his pastoral fields, while the great world debates, trades, and fights? Surely, in so far as a parson has a liberal or "University" education—and this catholicity in the very terms of his old studentship should suggest something—as he is anywise conversant with the greater pulsations of the past and present, there is little in which he will take more interest than "morality in politics." Here he will feel that he has need of the exercise of his sacred office. Here, specially, he asks and uses the grace of the kingdom of heaven. Political and international morality are only right and wrong on a grand scale, and it would be grotesquely strange if the laws of the kingdom of heaven belonged to the retail and not also to the wholesale of human intercourse. Are politics degrading? Have they anywhere acquired such evil reputation that the man who would have clean hands must touch them with gloves? Then it is because they have been severed from the higher influences in the government of God. It is part of the clergyman's duty to protest against such degradation, not as one who scolds over the hedge of a field which he does not enter, but as a man who is personally concerned in, and affected by, that which is being done, and bravely mixes in the crowd. And any reader of the New Testament might see that it is not alien to the character of a minister of Christ to find himself in the midst of a multitude while he is discharging his ministry well.

So much for the general attitude of the clergyman towards politics. I believe that these are the principles upon which he should carry himself in respect to them.

But there are particular modes in which these principles may be applied, and to a consideration of these I now invite your attention.

In promoting political morality, one practicable leading duty of the Church, speaking by great or small, is to affirm constantly that there is such a thing. It seems hard that this lesson should be needed. But it is needed. Even some of those who are moral in trade and private life are lax in politics. In political business we have to do with parties rather than individuals, and it seems as if directly men began to deal with corporate issues their moral sight became dimmed. They accept, not merely as a reproach to their adversaries, but as a guide for themselves, the delusive and degrading formula that a corporation has no body to be kicked or soul to be damned. The sense of responsibility seems to be dissipated if it cannot be put on particular shoulders, or as if a fractional fault involved its own absolution. In politics, moreover, men are committed to distinct battles, and then another mischievous proverb comes tainting their souls with the words, "All is fair in love and war." So they back the Buffs and hate the Blues. They hold to the one and despise the other with a vehemence which obliterates the nicer shades of righteous perception. Again, in the bustle of political business there is an inevitable loosening of social Conservatism; and, as men innocently help themselves from the table when a house is over-full of guests, say, at a wedding or a burial, so in a political crisis the greedy soul guiltily lays his hand on any pickings which seem to be loose. There are so many plausible excuses for common mischievous departures from political morality that it is too likely to be lost sight of even by ordinarily decent people. Thus the clergyman is imperatively called to affirm its very existence, and to show that it is impossible for individuality to be lost in corporate action. Let him teach that no one is obscure or unimportant. The attainment of victory depends at last upon the courage and endurance of the private soldier, and that which exalteth a nation is the righteousness of the individual, whether he work in company or alone.

And the clergyman will do more than talk. He will not let his colours hang limp from the mast during indifferent calms, and haul them down when the wind rises; but he will fly them when the political gales blow. He will not wince at a crisis, and try to make things pleasant to old women of both sexes, by then falling out of the ranks of men. The clergyman might not infrequently do more than he has dared, and they might be just such deeds as call out and fix the moral character of a place. There is nothing which, in its way, sends a more wholesome draught through a parish than the perception that the parson has the courage of his opinions. Though as a prominent man, with influences vaguely conceived to be occult, he might be pardoned for not taking a side when the parish is sharply divided, if he simply but plainly says what he thinks, he sets forward, not himself, but the cause of political morality. Cordially as he may dislike the sneaking safety of the ballot, he will not only vote for his man, though with his head in a box, as if he were pawning his individuality, but he will plead on the highest grounds with his fellows, that in the simple discharge of their duty as Christian citizens they are bound to exercise their rights as electors. The people are, in these realms, mainly responsible for the fabric of the legislature, and thus for the legislation of their country. It is to be regretted, for the credit of the Church, as well as the good of the commonwealth, that as there is a distinct political interpolation in the catechetical summary of our duty, some reference is not made to the Christian responsibility of the citizen, as well as to his obedience. Anyhow, as the clergyman desires political morality he will plead strenuously for its existence and observance, especially at political crises, and by a fearless exercise of politicaly rights. He will not be afraid for the sneer that in so doing he takes a lower level than his profession directs, or steps beyond the limit of his calling. On the contrary, he is in strict discharge of his duty when he reminds his fellow-citizens of theirs and helps them to perform it. Thus he makes religion to be with them a real thing, not to be thrust aside in periods of political eagerness, but needing them to be specially employed. It is at these times that men eminently require to be reminded that their religion calls and helps them to keep good faith in controversy, and to resist the moral malaria which then is sure to rise. Just in so far as a clergyman realises that he has cure of souls, he will then be found on the paddlebox of his parish helping to promote its true course, lustily protesting against all underhand procedure, and the imputation of evil motives; pleading for fair play, and a brave, unselfish discharge of political rights.

There is one other point on which the minister of the Church is bound to insist, and that is liberty for a man to change or correct his political views. Some men so fear being twitted with subjection to expediency, that they are checked in honest learning. But, remembering that we know only in part, there is no greater Christian law that that we should seek for and apply fresh light upon any matter in which we are concerned. It is true liberality and true conservatism to acknowledge and accept this from whatever quarter it may come. There are indeed people smart in raking up their old sayings against prominent politicians of all so-called parties, and sneering at them for a desertion of principle, if they do not always sing the old songs to exactly the same old tunes. But there is no deeper principle upon which to go, no surer bottom on which to stand, than a willingness to learn, and if necessary, to alter an opinion. To keep his current political morality sweet, a man must dare so to carry himself before a sneering world, and it is surely the work of a Church which is promised a spirit guiding into all truth, to help him in this course.

Canon **Farrar** followed with a paper on "Morality in Private Affairs;" and, after a short discussion, the meeting adjourned.

A WORKING MAN'S MEETING.

In the evening a working man's meeting was held, which was remarkable for its numbers and the hearty sympathy which the audience evinced with the Bishops and clergymen who addressed them. An effective speech was made by the Bishop of **Lichfield**, but the feature of the evening was the address of the Archbishop of **York**, who reminded his audience that he was the original projector of working-men's meetings at the Church Congress, having started them by the wish of the working men of York, in 1866, when the Congress met in that city. Having to look upon the various classes of society, he saw clearly that the Church of England must either come into closer contact with the working classes or else her national position would suffer, and ultimately, perhaps, be lost. Whatever changes were necessary to bring them into closer contact with the working classes, the Church ought to be prepared to face. He should like to hear from them what it was they really wanted, where the Church failed in approaching them, and what were the remedies for those defects. Referring to the position of working men, he quoted Mr. Leone Levi's estimate of the income of the working classes as £436,000,000, and of the upper and middle classes as £564,000,000. Out of that income the working class spent 20 per cent. upon luxuries, and the middle and upper classes 14 per cent. That showed clearly that the working classes had a great deal more power in their own hands than they had yet taken advantage of. The drink expenditure of 1880 was £122,000,000, while in 1873 and 1874, when the coal and iron trades were flourishing, it had gone up to 147 millions. Taking only half of those pernicious figures, putting them down to the credit or the discredit of the working classes, it would represent 61 millions spent on drink alone, or one-seventh of their whole income so spent. Such figures were perfectly enormous. If they would only practise the virtue of thrift the position of working men would be very different, while the condition of their wives and children would be changed as from darkness to light. His first advice was to consider the virtues of thrift, and to reflect about the little bits of blue ribbon which he was glad to see in Sunday buttonholes, and which actually meant the difference between poverty and comparative prosperity. The next vice he should like to refer to was one he had never heard of in sermons, though it leavened society at home and abroad—viz., the vice of gambling and betting. He adopted as his own the opinion of a certain high constable, who stated that unless something could be done to stop drinking and gambling in this country the country itself must go to ruin. The common sense of the question of gambling was that there was no such thing as fair or equal gambling. If two workmen betted and one lost his week's wages, the winner obtained what he had not expected, and did not know what he was going to do with, while the loser had parted with his own self-respect, the respect of all who heard of it, and had lost the food of his wife and children. The man who lost, therefore had lost a deal, while the man who had won had won almost nothing. It was said sometimes that if people played fairly and played long enough, gains and losses would balance each other at the end of a year or two; but those who embarked on this sort of unlimited play forgot one very important factor in the calculation, viz., that every purse had a bottom, and then when the last coin was staked was the very worst time for leaving off; yet play was then suddenly arrested, and the fine theory of bringing the circle round and making it symmetrical fell to the ground. Rascaldom so gathered round all sorts of gambling that there was no chance of fair play, and it must bring them in contact with those who, in any other transaction, they would most carefully shun. The best general rule that could be given was that they had better do without drinking, and that they must do without gambling.

The Bishop of **Bedford**, who was loudly applauded on rising, introduced himself to the meeting by saying that, though he was called Bishop of Bedford, he had nothing in the world to do with Bedford, being simply Bishop of East London. He got the title because there was an old Act of Parliament which said that suffragan Bishops must take their name from the list of places in that Act, and as there was no place in London named in the list he had to go to Bedford for a name. (Laughter.) He believed a great many people in East London thought he was a Bishop who, having been tried and failed at Bedford, was having a fresh trial. (Loud laughter.) The Bishop of Liverpool had spoken about Bishops going about in gigs. Bishops used also to go about in coaches-and-four. Some time ago there was a letter in the *Times* which pleaded for "gig-Bishops," or Bishops that would drive about the country in a gig-and-one. (Laughter.) He himself could not do this; he should very likely get upset if he tried; but he went about his work in busses and trams, and so he called himself a "bus-Bishop." (Much laughter.) The subject on which he had to speak was that of living for self or living for others. Take two men—one who lived for himself and the other for others, and there was no man who would not pass a just sentence between them. Why everybody preferred the man who lived for others was, that "the others" were ourselves. (Hear, hear.) Christians were sometimes called selfish, because it was said they wanted to escape hell and to get to heaven. To say this was about the same thing as to call the doorstep the house. Why the whole spirit and the whole tone of Christianity was to work not for self but for others. We did not go to the Bible to prove that self-sacrifice was a great and glorious thing. Each one had the testimony in his own heart. What was the highest, purest, and best enjoyment men had? Was it the storing up of money, was it the tumult of some passionate enjoyment, was it the triumph of some success? No. A poor neighbour fell sick, and his friend's heart bled for him, and he sat up with him after his day's work, and perhaps did a little hard work for him if he could—for the poor were very good to one another. A little unselfish action of this kind gave more true and lasting happiness than could ever have been got from the merriest night ever spent with boon companions in a public-house. (Applause.) He wished he could only tell his hearers how hateful to God and to all true manhood was selfish sin. Look at the drunkard—was not he selfish? When man drank down—and he (the Bishop) had seen it again and yet again—the good that was meant for his wife and child; when he brought home misery and want, and often disease and debt and ruin into the house, he ought to have guarded as the home blessed by God—among those who ought to be his nearest and dearest. Look at the sensualist. Was not he a selfish man—a man who, without a pang, perhaps, would bring ruin and shame and misery on the victim of his selfish passion? Look at the hard, unkind man, who by selfish indulgence of his temper kept stabbing the heart that he ought to have nourished and tenderly cared for. We hated these specimens of selfishness, but all the same we are nourishing some little form of selfishness less glaring, less scandalous, but no less sinful in the sight of God. Thrift was a good thing, but that could be spoiled by self-seeking; sobriety was a good thing, but it could be spoiled by self-righteousness. (Hear, hear.) The spirit which animated the individual ought to animate a body of men; and what was true of an individual was true of a nation. There were some selfish strikes, but he by no means said that all strikes were selfish, for some were often dignified by the splendid endurance of those who suffered by them. He had been for some years a member of a committee in London who went among the working men, sympathised with them, and recognised what noble elements actually exist in them. They consulted with working men on their trade movements, took counsel with them and endeavoured to lift them up to the light of God and to the purity of the true Christian conscience. One great instance of what he called social selfishness was class legislation. There was a time in this country when the rich had the power to exempt themselves from taxation and only tax others. That he called selfishness. He also called the enclosure of commons selfishness. (Cheers.) He thought, however, that when a class wished for legislation it was no longer class legislation, and that remark he might apply to the desire of the working men that the publichouse should be closed on Sunday. (Cheers.) Jingoism was a form of national selfishness and the opium traffic was somewhere about the same. Let them avoid such things. He urged them to throw away every idea of selfishness and live in the spirit of doing unto others as they wished to be done unto. (Cheers.)

The Rev. Canon **Hole** said that he looked upon that great assembly full of sadness, because he felt that they met so seldom as friends or Christians, and he recognised the peril of that estrangement. He knew that their union was the making of the prosperity of the nation and domestic peace. If they could meet in worship they would be nearer the eternal harmonies of heaven. He felt sure that there was nothing which could break down the barriers and the walls between them but that universal Christian love which comprehended and taught the duty and the beauty of work. (Hear, hear.) No statesman could enact it. No philosopher could suggest, no schoolmaster could explain it—it was only taught and communicated to them by the revelation and the Spirit of God, and that very bond of peace, of all virtues, not only embraced all gracious sympathies, but it presented them in the most attractive way, and, following the example of the Divine Master, it went about not only speaking but doing good. He hoped they would not think there had been too much class legislation. To his mind, the working man had been specially favoured. It appeared to him that in this respect the working man very much resembled a man in his own parish, who, when he met with an accident or was ill, received the attention of all the old women in the parish, and they all prescribed different remedies. If he were a working man and were supposed to have all the disorders they were supposed to have, he should say, "Pray, gentlemen, do not let me monopolise all your valuable attention and absorb all your precious time; there are plenty of other invalids who are waiting to have your prescriptions." (Cheers and laughter.) There was a story told of a clergyman who went to the bedside of an old lady who was ill, and said to her, "You know that the churchyard is overcrowded, except on the north side, and you know that the people will not be buried on the north side. But it is a mere superstition, it is not a matter of much consequence. Now your days cannot be much longer. Give me your authority that when you die you may be buried on the north side." The old lady replied, "Well, as you say it is not a matter of much consequence, perhaps you'd give us the lead." (Laughter) If he (the Canon) were a working man he should be very much inclined to say to some of his would-be instructors, "Give us a lead." "Gie us a lead into some public garden, or gie us a garden of our own." (Hear, hear.) If they received a lead in the way of a picture gallery, they would be much more likely to get to the Church than through the gin-house. (Hear, hear.) Why should not the rich gentlemen give up their parks a dozen times a year, and let the people breathe. It was said that they would destroy everything if that were done, but he did not believe it. It was not true. (Hear, hear.) Trust people and tell them that they were trusted, and they would do no harm. His wish and that of his clerical brethren was to make the Church of England the Church of the English people. They were ashamed of the time when the shepherds ate the fat and clothed themselves with wool. They did not then feed the flock, but they were now giving some proof of reparation, and shepherds had gone back to the flocks, and were restoring sheep to the fold. There was now hardly a village where there was not a responsible pastor, and he appealed to his hearers, whether in cases of sorrow or sickness, or want, to show his sympathy, and give his help to those who were afflicted or distressed in mind, body, or estate. Much had been done, but much remained to be done. The parish churches of England belonged to the parishioners, and they had the right to demand that they should be free and open. (Cheers.) A working man who went to a Church said that he found some of the people all sitting in seats with doors to them, and others in the pit and side boxes, and when he walked up and down to find a seat he seemed like a chap who wanted to go in without paying, and so he came out again. The English Church was for the English people, and the churches ought to be adapted to the people's tastes and opportunities. In February last at Leicester, they had in one of the churches a celebration of the Holy Communion before daybreak. People said that the working men would not come, but there were as many as 220 present, and 20 others were obliged to go away or they would have been too late for their work. The speaker then related an instance of a working man who in conversation with the parson told him that the reason he went to his church was because he saw the clergyman going to his business when he (the working man) was going to his work. Canon Hole said that people who taught little children to say,

Shake off dull sloth and early rise,
To pay thy morning sacrifice,

ought themselves to have their blinds up betimes. He thought that sermons would be interesting and impressive if they were spoken and not read. There was about the same difference between a man reading and preaching a sermon as between a horse with his head in his nosebag and the same horse galloping across country. (Hear, hear.) He wished to conclude by adding his entreaty to the working men to respect their work. He asked them to pray for the clergy, as the clergy certainly prayed for them, that they might love one another, and that all men might endeavour to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. He hoped they would remember that at the Judgment Day the Judge would welcome those to His glory who had done works of mercy. Let them strive with heart and hand to bear one another's burdens and share one another's mirth, for so only could they fulfil the law and claim the rewards of Christ.

The Rev. Canon **Knox-Little** hoped they would bear with him when he told those present that he had risen from a bed of sickness in order to address them. (Hear.) When he was a boy at school he learned one phrase of the Latinists—Ne sutor ultra crepidam—which being interpreted meant, "Mind your own business." He intended therefore to stick to his, and that was to advance the kingdom of Christ. He had to speak to them that night on a subject that belonged to that kingdom, and that was the morality of the workshop. What the working men of England had to realise was that in the workshop they had a great opportunity upon which to exercise morality, and choose between right and wrong. He urged the working men to consider that the workshop gave a great opportunity for truth, appealing to them to use the friendship and influence of the workshop in the cause of truth and rather risk being sent by their employers about their business than to depart from the truth in the ordinary transactions of life. Referring to the responsibility for language used in the workshop, he said men who had tried to serve God, and to be honest and pure, had asked him, "How am I to be honest and pure—how am I to keep down my passions, and to restrain my tongue, if half a dozen fellows round me are jeering at my religion, talking beastliness, talking filthiness, and talking blasphemy?" Oh, let them choose the right, and put aside the wrong, and when they saw a young chap from his home trying to do his duty, let them stand by him, (Cheers.) It was always better to do right—it was Christ-like to do what conscience said was right. He wanted them to remember three great words—first "duty," for God expected them to do their duty, as there was an enemy which they could not face and could not fly, and that was conscience; then let them remember "sin," and above all "Christ." (Cheers.) Christ would help His Church; Christ would help the working man who wanted to use right influence—Christ the Intercessor, Christ the nearest, the dearest, the most lasting, and the best.

The proceedings terminated in the usual way.

(Continued on page 634.)

Mr. Musgrave Heaphy, C.E., writes to the *Times*, suggesting means of reducing the risk of fire in connection with electric lighting when introduced into private dwellings. Arrangements are now in progress (he says) for a vast development of the electric light, and instead of its being confined to a few large buildings, railway stations, and open spaces, we shall probably before long have thousands of dwelling-houses, shops, hotels, business premises, and warehouses, &c., illuminated by it. For each of these the walls, ceilings, and floors will be threaded by a series of wires, any one of which might become a continuous line of fire; and when it is remembered that these wires are often covered with most highly inflammable substances, such as cotton soaked in paraffine, india-rubber and tape, cotton and tar, &c., it will at once be apparent how sudden and disastrous the consequences might be. In large buildings a thorough inspection will be made by officers of the fire company or companies concerned, but in the great majority of private dwelling-houses such supervision will be almost entirely out of the question. Such occupiers and owners, by attending to the following simple rules, will most materially reduce the risk of fire. (1) See that no naked wires are used. Try and arrange that they be covered with a material rendered as incombustible as possible. (2) See that all wires are kept at least 1in. apart from each other (if they are "leads" 2in.), and 1in. from all metallic substances. (3) See that no wire hangs loosely, and that they are in such a position as not to be liable to derangement or injury from external causes. Get them enclosed, if possible, in wood or slate beading having a continuous fillet to keep the wire separate. (4) See that none of the fastenings of the wires are composed of metal. (5) Have a "cut out" for every room, and, if possible, for every light. A "cut out" is a short piece of easily fusible metal—such as lead—inserted in the wire conveying the electricity to the light or lights. (6) See that your wires—unless they have a waterproof covering—are kept free from wet. This last rule is more important than it seems, for, paradoxical as it may appear to those not versed in the subject, water can easily bring about a fire through its property of conducting electricity. The above rules apply to incandescent lighting only; as in every case of arc or semi-incandescent installations an inspection will probably be made by the fire-office insuring the building.

Notwithstanding the additional quantity which was printed of Canon Farrar's new work, *The Early Days of Christianity*, the entire supply prepared has proved inadequate to meet the demands of the trade, and the work is consequently again being reprinted. The new edition is expected to be ready by the 13th inst.

A Chinese teacher in Hong-Kong has completed a present which he intends for the Royal Princes. It consists of a stanza of poetry, composed by the teacher himself, and contains thirty-three distinct and well-formed Chinese characters written out in the full style without any contractions, on one grain of unhulled rice. The grain of paddy is enclosed, under a magnifying glass, in a silver locket. Another Chinaman has inscribed sixty Chinese characters on a single sesamum seed.

MESSRS. HATCHARDS' LIST.

Crown 8vo, cloth extra, 500 pages, price 7s. 6d.

HERALDS OF THE CROSS; or, the Fulfilling of the Command.
Chapters on Missionary Work. By Miss F. E. ARNOLD FORSTER.

"Told in a beautifully simple style, sure to interest children, for whom the book is intended."—*Graphic.*

"This work does not need any adventitious circumstances to recommend it; it is emphatically a successful book, and cannot fail, we should think, to become a general favourite in Christian families interested in missionary work, and we do not think anything so good of its kind has been published for thirty years."—*Church Missionary Intelligence.*

WORKS BY BISHOP OXENDEN.

1. **SHORT LECTURES ON THE SUNDAY GOSPELS.**
   Advent to Easter. 17th Thousand. } Fcap. 8vo, large type, 2s. 6d.; morocco, 7s. each.
   Easter to Advent. 16th Thousand. }
   Two Volumes bound in one, roan, 7s. 6d.; morocco, 10s. 6d.
2. **THE PARABLES OF OUR LORD.**
   35th Thousand. Fcap. 8vo, large type, cloth, 3s.
3. **THE PATHWAY OF SAFETY; or, Counsel to the Awakened.**
   281st Thousand. Fcap. 8vo, large type, 2s. 6d.; roan, 4s. 6d.; morocco, 7s.
   Cheap Edition, small type, limp, 1s.; roan, 2s. 6d.; morocco, 4s. 6d.
4. **THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.**
   47th Thousand. Fcap. 8vo, cloth, large type, 2s. 6d.; roan, 4s. 6d.; morocco, 7s.
   Cheap Edition, small type, limp, 1s.; roan, 2s. 6d.; morocco, 4s. 6d.
5. **PORTRAITS FROM THE BIBLE.** Two Volumes.
   Old Testament. 37th Thousand. } Fcap. 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d. each.
   New Testament. 25th Thousand. }
   Two volumes bound in one, roan, 7s. 6d.; morocco, 10s. 6d.
6. **OUR CHURCH AND HER SERVICES.**
   31st Thousand. Fcap. 8vo, large type, cloth, 2s. 6d.
7. **COTTAGE SERMONS; or, Plain Words to the Poor.**
   12th Thousand. Fcap. 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.
8. **COTTAGE READINGS.**
   7th Thousand. Fcap. 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.
9. **THE EARNEST CHURCHMAN;**
   Or, WHY I AM A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.
   10th Thousand. Fcap. 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.; roan, 4s. 6d.; morocco, 7s.
10. **A SIMPLE EXPOSITION OF THE PSALMS.**
    8th Thousand. Two Vols., crown 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d. each.
11. **DECISION.**
    27th Thousand. 18mo, large type, cloth, 1s. 6d.
12. **CONFIRMATION; or, Are you Ready to Serve Christ?**
    552d Thousand. 18mo, cloth, 6d.; sewed 3d.; or 2s. 6d. per dozen, post free.
13. **COUNSELS TO THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN CONFIRMED.**
    Or, NOW IS THE TIME TO SERVE CHRIST.
    A Sequel to "Confirmation; or, Are you Ready to Serve Christ?"
    10th Thousand. 18mo, limp cloth, 1s.
14. **BAPTISM SIMPLY EXPLAINED.**
    18th Thousand. 18mo, limp cloth, 1s.; sewed, 6d.
15. **THE LORD'S SUPPER SIMPLY EXPLAINED.**
    75th Thousand. 18mo, limp cloth, 1s.; sewed, 6d.
16. **THE EARNEST COMMUNICANT.**
    A PREPARATION FOR THE LORD'S TABLE.
    Red Rubric Edition, cloth, 2s.; roan, 3s.; morocco, &c., 4s. to 21s.
    Common Edition. 458th Thousand. 1s.; roan, 2s.; morocco, &c., 3s. to 21s.
17. **FAMILY PRAYERS FOR FOUR WEEKS.**
    1st Series. 120th Thousand. } Fcp. 8vo, 2s. 6d.; roan, 4s. 6d.; morocco, 7s. each.
    2nd Series. 22nd Thousand. }
    Two Volumes, bound in one, roan, 7s. 6d.; morocco, 10s. 6d.
18. **FAMILY PRAYERS. COMPLETE EIGHT WEEKS.**
    Very large type. Square crown 8vo, cloth, 6s.; roan, 9s.; morocco, 12s.
19. **PRAYERS FOR PRIVATE USE.**
    118th Thousand. 18mo, cloth, 1s.; roan, 2s.; morocco, or calf, 3s.
20. **WORDS OF PEACE; or, The Blessings and Trials of Sickness.**
    71st Thousand. Fcp. 8vo, cloth, 1s. 6d.
21. **THE HOME BEYOND; or, A Happy Old Age.**
    163rd Thousand. Fcap. 8vo, cloth, 1s. 6d.
    Bound with "Words of Peace," roan, 5s.; morocco, 7s. 6d.

Over Two Million Copies of this Author's Works have been sold.

HATCHARDS, PUBLISHERS, 187, PICCADILLY, LONDON.

WELLS GARDNER, DARTON, AND CO.'S NEW LIST.

T. PYM'S NEW BOOK.

PICTURES from the POETS. An Illustrated Book of Child-life, in red and brown Tints, beautifully printed in the best style of Chromo-Lithography. Bound in an Illustrated Cover, paper boards, cloth back, 3s. 6d.

MORE OUTLINE PICTURES for the LITTLE ONES to COLOUR. By T. PYM. Carefully printed in sepia on a grey paper specially made for the purpose. 4to, paper covers, 1s.

CANON DANIEL'S NEW WORK.

THE OFFICES and LITANY. An Introduction to the Study of the Prayer-Book. By the Rev. EVAN DANIEL, M.A., Principal of the National Society's Training College, Battersea. Fcap. 8vo, paper covers, 8d.; cloth boards, 10d.

EIGHTH EDITION.

THE PRAYER BOOK: its Language, History, and Contents. By the Rev. EVAN DANIEL, M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 6s.

AMUSEMENT AND INSTRUCTION ON A NEW PLAN.

HAPPY SUNDAY AFTERNOONS. With Numerous Outline Illustrations of Bible Subjects, printed on superfine lined paper, for the Little Ones to Colour and Write About. 4to, paper covers, 1s.; cloth boards, 2s.

"LEFT TILL CALLED FOR." By the Authors of "Honour Bright," &c. With Numerous Outline Illustrations, oblong cloth boards, 1s.

THE "PRIZE" BIBLE. Printed in large type, on toned paper, with Numerous Illustrations and Twelve Coloured Chromo Plates, cloth extra, bevelled boards, gilt edges, 12s. 6d.

MY FAVOURITE STORY-BOOK. 4to, cloth boards, 2s. The Illustrations are printed in sepia and occupy a page each, with Letterpress to face.

NEW BOOK BY THE AUTHOR OF "SIX TO SIXTEEN," "WE AND THE WORLD," &c.

A WEEK SPENT in a GLASS-POND. By the GREAT WATER-BEETLE. Written by Mrs. EWIN. With upwards of Forty fully Coloured Illustrations by W. ANDRE. 4to, illustrated paper boards, cloth backs, coloured edges, 3s. 6d.

BY THE AUTHOR OF "WATCHERS ON THE LONGSHIPS."

MARTIN the SKIPPER: a Book for Boys and Seaside Folk. By JAMES F. COBB. Illustrated. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3s. 6d. [Shortly.

London: WELLS GARDNER, DARTON, and CO., 2, Paternoster-buildings, E.C.

THE RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY'S LIST.

A large variety of Illustrated PRESENTATION BOOKS, in elegant bindings and at all prices, may be inspected at the Religious Tract Society's Retail Depots—London: 65, St. Paul's-churchyard (opposite the Northern entrance to the Cathedral), and 164, Piccadilly. Liverpool: 18, Slater-street. Manchester: 100, Corporation-street. Brighton: 31, Western-road.

BUTLER'S ANALOGY, with the Three Sermons on Human Nature only. Crown 8vo, 1s. cloth.

BUTLER'S Analysis of the Analogy for Students. 1s., cloth.

BELL—Angelic Beings: their Nature and Ministry. By the Rev. Canon Bell. 2s. 6d., cloth.

BICKERSTETH—The Rock of Ages; or, Scripture Testimony to the One Eternal Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. By the Rev. E. H. BICKERSTETH, M.A. Crown 8vo, 4s., cloth boards.

BICKERSTETH—The Spirit of Life; or, Scripture Testimony to the Divine Person and Work of the Holy Spirit. By the Rev. E. H. BICKERSTETH, M.A. Crown 8vo, 4s., cloth boards.

BOURDILLON, Rev. F.—Help to Family Worship, A; or, Short Forms of Morning and Evening Prayer, for Four Weeks. Small crown 8vo, 1s., cloth boards.

BOURDILLON—Large Type Edition. Imperial 16mo, 2s., cloth boards.

BOURDILLON—Family Readings on the Gospels. St. Matthew, 3s. 6d., cloth boards; ST. MARK, 4s., cloth boards; ST. JOHN, 4s., cloth boards.

DAWSON—The Chain of Life in Geological Time. A Sketch of the Origin and Succession of Animals and Plants. By J. W. DAWSON, LL.D., Author of "Acadian Geology," &c. With numerous Engravings. Crown 8vo, 6s. 6d., cloth boards.

D'AUBIGNE—The History of the Reformation in the Sixteenth Century. By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNÉ, D.D. Library Edition. Five Volumes, 8vo, cloth boards, 20s. the set; half-bound, 30s.; whole calf, 36s.; morocco, 42s. Illustrated Edition. One Volume, royal 4to, with Engravings on Steel and Wood, fine paper, 21s., elegantly bound in cloth, gilt edges; or 60s. in morocco elegant. Cheap Edition. In One Volume, 8s. cloth; 12s., half-bound; 15s., calf.

DEMAUS—William Tyndale: a Biography. A Contribution to the Early History of the English Bible. By the late Rev. R. DEMAUS, M.A. With Portrait. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d., cloth boards.

DEMAUS—Hugh Latimer: a Biography. By the late Rev. R. Demaus, M.A. With Portrait. Crown 8vo, 5s., cloth boards.

DUNKIN—The Midnight Sky. Familiar Notes on the Stars and Planets. By EDWIN DUNKIN, of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, F.R.S. With Thirty-two Star Maps and other Illustrations. New and Revised Edition. 7s. 6d., cloth boards; 9s., with gilt edges.

EDERSHEIM—Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ. By the Rev. Dr. EDERSHEIM. 5s., cloth boards, gilt edges.

EDERSHEIM—The Temple: its Ministry and Services at the Time of Jesus CHRIST. By the Rev. Dr. EDERSHEIM. Imp. 16mo, 5s. cloth boards, gilt edges.

EDERSHEIM—Bible History. By the Rev. Dr. Edersheim. Each Vol., in crown 8vo, 2s. 6d., cloth boards.

Vol. I.—THE WORLD BEFORE the FLOOD, and the HISTORY of the PATRIARCHS.
Vol. II.—THE EXODUS and the WANDERINGS in the WILDERNESS.
Vol. III.—ISRAEL in CANAAN under JOSHUA and the JUDGES.
Vol. IV.—ISRAEL under SAMUEL, SAUL, and DAVID, to the BIRTH of SOLOMON.
Vol. V.—HISTORY of JUDAH and ISRAEL, from the BIRTH of SOLOMON to the REIGN of AHAB.

EVERARD—Talks about Home Life. By the Rev. George Everard, M.A. Fcap. 8vo, 1s. 6d., cloth boards.

EVERARD—Words of Friendly Counsel about Turning to God. Fcap. 8vo, 1s. 6d. cloth boards.

EVERARD—Talks about Christian Living. Fcap. 8vo, 1s. 6d., cloth boards.

FLEMING—Readings for Winter Gatherings, Temperance and Mothers' Meetings, &c. First, Second, and Third Series. Edited by the Rev. Canon FLEMING, B.D. Crown 8vo, each 1s., neat cover; 1s. 6d., cloth.

FOXE—The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe. Revised and Corrected, with Appendices, Glossary, and Indices. By the Rev. JOSIAH PRATT, M.A. Also, an Introduction, Biographical and Descriptive. By the Rev. JOHN STOUGHTON, D.D. In Eight Volumes, royal 8vo, Plates, £2 10s. the set; red edges, £3.

FOX, Rev. Henry Watson, B.A., Missionary to the Telugus—A Memoir. By the Rev. G. T. FOX, M.A. Illustrated. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d., boards.

GARBETT—The Soul's Life: its Commencement, Progress, and Maturity. By the Rev. Canon GARBETT. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d., cloth boards.

GARBETT—Experiences of the Inner Life. Lessons from its Duties, Joys, and Conflicts. By the Rev. Canon GARBETT. A Sequel to "The Soul's Life." Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d., cloth boards.

HOWSON—Meditations on the Miracles of Christ. By the Very Rev. J. S. HOWSON, D.D., Dean of Chester. First and Second Series. Each crown 8vo, 3s., cloth boards.

HOWSON—Scenes from the Life of St. Paul. By the Very Rev. J. S. Howson, D.D., Dean of Chester. With Illustrations by Paolo Priolo. Imperial 8vo, 6s., hansomely bound.

HARPER—Illustrated Letters to My Children from the Holy Land. By Henry A. HARPER. With Coloured Frontispiece and Engravings from Original Sketches by the Author. Imperial 8vo, 5s., handsome cloth gilt.

JENKINS—The Devotion of the Sacred Heart. An Exposure of its Errors and Dangers. By ROBERT C. JENKENS, M.A., Hon. Canon of Canterbury. 1s., cloth boards.

JONES—Past and Present in the East. By the Rev. Harry Jones, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral. With Fine Engravings by Edward Whymper. Quarto, cloth boards, gilt edges, 5s.

LEATHES—Grounds of Christian Hope: a Sketch of the Evidences of Christianity. By STANLEY LEATHES, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's, Professor of Hebrew, King's College. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. cloth boards.

LILLINGSTON—The Christian Garland. A Popular Exposition of 2 Peter i. 5—7. By the Rev. F. A. C. LILLINGSTON, M.A., Vicar of St. Barnabas, Holloway. Fcap. 8vo, 2s., cloth boards.

RAWLINSON—The Origin of Nations. In Two Parts. I. On Early Civilisations. II. On Ethnic Affinities. By Canon RAWLINSON, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History, Oxford. With Maps. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d., cloth boards.

TANNER, Rev. J.—Saving Faith: What is it? A Scriptural Inquiry and APPEAL. Crown 8vo, 8d., cloth boards.

TITCOMB—Before the Cross: a Book of Devout Meditation. By the Right Rev. J. H. TITCOMB, D.D., Bishop of Rangoon. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d., cloth boards, red edges.

VERNON—"The Harvest of a Quiet Eye." Leisure Thoughts for Busy Lives. By the Rev. J. R. VERNON, M.A. With Engravings by Noel Humphreys, Harrison Weir, and other Artists. 6s. 6d., cloth gilt.

VERNON—Ingleside and Wayside Musings: a Companion to "The Harvest of a QUIET EYE." By the Rev. J. R. VERNON, M.A., Rector of St. Audries, Bridgwater. With numerous fine Engravings. 6s., cloth gilt.

VERNON—Random Truths in Common Things. By the Rev. J. R. Vernon, M.A. Engravings, 7s., cloth elegant.

WHATELY—Cousin Mabel's Sketches from Life. By Miss E. J. Whately. Crown 8vo, 4s., cloth, gilt edges.

WHATELY—Cousin Mabel's Experiences. By Miss E. J. Whately. Crown 8vo, 4s., cloth boards.

WHATELY—Gospel in Bohemia. The Sketches of Bohemian Religious History. By Miss E. J. WHATELY. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d., cloth boards.

PRESENT-DAY TRACTS.

BY EMINENT WRITERS ON APOLOGETIC, DOCTRINAL, AND PRACTICAL SUBJECTS.

FOURPENCE EACH.

No. I.—Christianity and Miracles at the Present Day. By the Rev. Principal CAIRNS, D.D.
No. II.—The Historical Evidence of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the DEAD. By the Rev. Prebendary ROW, M.A.
No. III.—Christ the Central Evidence of Christianity. By Principal Cairns, D.D.
No. IV.—Christianity and the Life that now is. By the Rev. Professor Blaikie, D.D., LL.D., Author of "Better Days for Working People," "The Personal Life of Dr. Livingstone."
No. V.—The Existence and Character of God. By the Rev. Prebendary Row, Author of "Christian Evidence in Relation to Modern Thought," &c.
No. VI.—The Success of Christianity and Modern Explanations of it. By the Rev. Principal CAIRNS, D.D., Author of "Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century."
No. VII.—Christianity and Secularism, compared in their Influence and Effects. By Dr. W. G. BLAIKIE.

London: 56, Paternoster-row; and of all Booksellers.

WORKS BY THE LATE REV. DR. PUSEY,

CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, AND REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

THE MINOR PROPHETS; with a Commentary, Explanatory and Practical, and Introductions to the Several Books. 4to, cloth, £1 11s. 6d.

DANIEL the PROPHET. Nine Lectures delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Oxford. Third Edition. Sixth Thousand. 8vo, cloth, 10s. 6d.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS. Three Vols., 8vo, cloth, price 6s. each.

OCCASIONAL and PAROCHIAL SERMONS. 8vo, cloth, price 6s.

PAROCHIAL and CATHEDRAL SERMONS. 8vo, cloth, price 6s. [Just published.

UNIVERSITY SERMONS. Three Vols., 8vo, cloth, price 6s. each.

LENTEN SERMONS. 8vo, cloth, price 6s.

SERMONS on REPENTANCE and AMENDMENT of LIFE. Preached at Leeds. 8vo, cloth, price 6s.

ELEVEN ADDRESSES on the LOVE of GOD for SOULS, and on INTERCESSION. 8vo, cloth, price 3s. 6d.

THE DOCTRINE of HOLY BAPTISM, as taught by Holy Scripture and the Fathers. (Formerly "Tract for the Times," No. 67.) 8vo, cloth, 5s.

THE DOCTRINE of the REAL PRESENCE, as contained in the Fathers from the Death of St. John the Evangelist to the Fourth General Council. 1855. With the Sermon. 8vo, cloth, 7s. 6d.

THE REAL PRESENCE, the Doctrine of the English Church, with a Vindication of the Reception by the Wicked and of the Adoration of our Lord Jesus Christ truly Present. 8vo, 6s.

THE ROYAL SUPREMACY, Not an Arbitrary Authority, but Limited by the Laws of the Church of which Kings are Members. Ancient Precedents. 8vo, 7s.

THE COUNCILS of the CHURCH, from the Council of Jerusalem to the Close of the Second General Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. 1857. 6s.

ON the CLAUSE "AND THE SON," in regard to the EASTERN CHURCH and the BONN CONFERENCE: a Letter to the Rev. H. P. LIDDON, D.D., Ireland Professor of Exegesis, Canon of St. Paul's. 8vo, cloth, 5s.

WHAT is of FAITH as to EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT? In Reply to Dr. Farrar's Challenge in his "Eternal Hope," 1879. Sixth Thousand. 8vo, cloth, 286 pp., 3s. 6d.

PARKER and CO., Oxford; and 6, Southampton-street, Strand, London.
And RIVINGTONS.

TINSLEY BROTHERS' NEW LIST.

New and Important Work by the Author of "The Life of George IV."

The Lives of the Royal Dukes and PRINCESSES of the FAMILY of GEORGE the THIRD. By PERCY FITZGERALD, M.A., Author of "The Life of George the Fourth," "A New History of the English Stage," &c. In 2 vols., demy 8vo, 30s. [On the 20th instant.

New Work Edited by the Author of "Berlin Under the New Empire."—With numerous Engravings,

Paris in Peril. Edited by Henry Vizetelly, Author of "Berlin Under the New Empire," &c. In 2 vols., demy 8vo, 30s. [In a few days.

Reminiscences of an Old Bohemian. 2 vols., post 8vo, price 21s.

NEW NOVELS AT EVERY LIBRARY.

A Second Edition, in 3 vols., of the Popular Novel,

Proper Pride, will be ready in a few days.

"An exceedingly clever story . . . . It abounds, moreover, in telling situations, some of them admirably comic, while others are touching; and it is thoroughly original."—Times.

Sweet Inisfail. By Richard Dowling, Author of "The Mystery of Killard," "The Duke's Sweetheart," "Sapphire Ring," &c. 3 vols.

Chums: a Tale of the Queen's Navy. 3 vols.

"Since poor Captain Marryat's time there has not been a better story of its class. The descriptions of scenery and places are throughout good, and the dialogue is sprightly and natural without being slangy, the fault usually to be found with the conversational parts of maritime tales . . . 'Chums' is a clever, amusing book."—Morning Post.

Gladys: a Frivolous Novel. By "TRAMIO." 3 vols.

Allerton Towers. By Annie Thomas (Mrs. PENDER CUDLIP), Author of "Eyre of Blendon," "Society's Puppets," &c. 3 vols.

"Is entitled to the foremost place amongst the author's numerous productions."—Morning Post.

Buried for Gold. By A. C. Sampson, Author of "Crushed Beneath his Idol," "The Scarborough Belle," &c. 3 vols. [This day.

Talbot's Folly. By W. B. Guinee. 3 vols. [On the 15th October.

TINSLEY BROTHERS, 8, Catherine-street, Strand.

THE "DR. PUSEY" MEMORIAL FUND.

TRUSTEES.
EARL BEAUCHAMP.
HON. C. L. WOOD.
REV. CANON LIDDON.

Subscriptions extending (if desired) over five years may be paid into the Old Bank, Oxford; and Messrs. Hoare and Co., 37, Fleet-street, E.C.; or to Mr. JOHN W. BUCHANAN RIDDELL, Hon. Sec., 65, Belgrave-road, S.W.

DURHAM GRAMMAR SCHOOL.

KING'S SCHOLARSHIPS.

THE EXAMINATION of CANDIDATES for the King's Scholarships will take place in the CHAPTER ROOM, on Wednesday, the 15th; Thursday, the 16th; and Friday, the 17th November, 1882, at nine a.m., when FOUR SCHOLARS will be appointed to supply the present Vacancies, if so many Candidates shall be found deserving.

These Scholarships (18 in number) are of the an nual value of nearly £40 (£30 in money, with exemption from £9 9s. 0d. school fees), and are tenable at the School for four years, to which a fifth may be added by the Dean.

Any one under fifteen years of age, whether previously at the School or not, is admissible as a Candidate, provided always that his parents are not in wealthy circumstances.

Candidates must send their names, with Certificates of their birth, and statement of circumstances, to Mr. RICHARDSON PEELE, The College, Durham, on or before Wednesday, the 8th November.

Further information may be obtained on applying to the
REV. W. A. FEARON, M.A.,
Head Master.

28th September, 1882.

HART, SON, PEARD, & CO.,

MANUFACTURERS OF

CHURCH METAL WORK.

ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUES.

SECTION I.—CAST IRON GATES, RAILINGS, CROSSES, &c.
SECTION II.—WROUGHT IRON do. do.
SECTION III.—LOCKS, HINGES, BOLTS, BELL PULLS, &c.
SECTION IV.—GAS, CANDLE, AND OIL FITTINGS.
SECTION V.—CHURCH PLATE, BRASSES, LECTERNS, &c.
SECTION VI.—FURNITURE FOR DOMESTIC USE.

MEDALS—
LONDON, PARIS, DUBLIN, AND PHILADELPHIA.

SHOW ROOMS:
168, REGENT STREET, W.,
AND
53 to 58, WYCH ST., STRAND, LONDON.

TURKEY, PERSIAN, AND INDIAN CARPETS.

THOS. BONTOR AND COMPANY, LATE
WATSON, BONTOR, and CO.,
Nos. 35 & 36, OLD BOND STREET, LONDON, W.

Superior Brussels, Velvet, Saxony, and all other Carpets in the Newest Designs.

SCHWEITZER'S

COCOATINA,

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.

GUARANTEED PURE SOLUBLE COCOA. WITH THE EXCESS OF FAT EXTRACTED.

THE FACULTY pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for BREAKFAST, LUNCHEON, or SUPPER, and invaluable for invalids and children."

Made instantaneously with Boiling Water.

Adopted as a Medical comfort in the Royal Navy.

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.

Being without sugar spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates, keeps better in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas THICKENED yet WEAKENED with starch, &c., and IN REALITY CHEAPER, than such mixtures, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup costing less than a halfpenny.

COCOATINA A LA VANILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Vanilla Chocolate, and may be taken when other chocolate is prohibited.

In tins at 1s. 6d., 3s., 5s. 6d., &c. By Chemists and Grocers.

H. SCHWEITZER and Co., 10, Adam-street, London, W.C.

LAMPLOUGH'S PYRETIC SALINE

Have it in your houses, and use no other, for it is the safe antidote in Fevers, Eruptive Affections, Sea or Bilious Sickness, Smallpox, and Headache, having peculiar and exclusive merits.

In bottles, 2s. 6d., 4s. 6d., 11s., 21s. each.

LAMPLOUGH'S CONCENTRATED LIME JUICE SYRUP, "A perfect luxury:" effervescing with Pyretic Saline, a delightful summer drink. *In bottles, 2s. and 4s. 6d. each.*

Sold by all Chemists: and the Maker, 113, Holborn, London.

EDE AND SON,

ROBE MAKERS,

By Special Appointment,
TO HER MAJESTY AND THE ROYAL FAMILY,
THE LORD CHANCELLOR, THE BISHOPS,
CORPORATION OF LONDON, &c.

ECCLESIASTICAL AND UNIVERSITY GOWNS
of every description.
Rochet, Chimere and Lawn Sleeves.

Surplices for Clergy and Choir,

Hoods, Stoles, College Caps,
Cassocks, Bands, Band Cases,
Scarves, Clergy Collars, Sermon Cases.

FULL-SLEEVE GOWNS FOR PRESENTATION

PEERS', LEGAL, AND CORPORATION ROBES.
Established 1689.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

NOTICE.

The JOHN BULL may be obtained on the day of publication, at Messrs. SMITH and SON's Railway Book-stalls, or of any Newsagent, at 5d. per copy, or direct from the Office on the following terms:—

Annual Subscription ...	In advance,	23s.	Credit, 28s.
Half-Yearly ditto	,,	12s.	,, 14s.
One Quarter		7s.	

Two or more Copies, in advance, One Guinea each pe annum.

CHARGE FOR ADVERTISEMENTS.

Advertisements of Public Companies, 1s. per line.

General Trade Advertisements (Reduction for Series), 9d. per line.

Notices of Births, Marriages, and Deaths inserted at 3s. 6d. each.

Advertisements over Leader, 1s. per line.

N.B.—Advertisements from the country must be prepaid; sums not exceeding 5s. may be sent in stamps; above that amount by Post-Office Orders, made payable (at the FLEET STREET Money Order Office) to THOMAS DIXON, 6, Whitefriars-street, Fleet-street, E.C.

JOHN BULL.

LONDON, OCTOBER 7.

HISTORY OF THE WEEK.

The evacuation of Egypt by the English expeditionary force has already commenced, and in the course of a few more days all the troops that are not intended to form part of the army of occupation will be on their way homewards, and in another fortnight Sir GARNET WOLSELEY and his staff will quit the country. The soldiers have done their work with ridiculous ease; it remains now for the diplomatists to secure adequate and permanent advantages from the victory that has been achieved. It would be idle to suggest that sensible observers look forward with the same confidence to the achievement of diplomatic triumphs in Egypt with which they anticipated the military successes. It was from the first certain that the supremacy of the British arms would be established, but there is by no means a similar certainty that the English Government will have the skill and the courage to overcome the more formidable hostilities and rivalries that will have to be encountered in the task of settling the affairs of Egypt upon a new and firm basis. The only justification for the war is that it was urged for the maintenance of British interests. And in the reorganisation of the Egyptian government, consequent upon the conclusion of peace it is essential that the fullest securities shall be taken for the future preponderance of England in Egypt that will alone place these interests beyond the reach of danger. The English Government can well demand ample time for the elaboration of its plans for dealing with the problems of Egyptian politics, but the English people will in the end look for solid advantages for the sacrifices made of blood and treasure. No particular notice has been taken in England of Mr. GLADSTONE's protestations of disinterestedness in his Egyptian policy, because the English people are aware how meaningless the sanctimonious hypocrisies in which Mr. GLADSTONE revels are. But if any attempt were made to carry such professions into practice their Egyptian policy would prove the ruin of the Radical Government rather than, as they fondly hope it will be, their salvation.

The supporters of the Government affect to observe a considerable improvement in the condition of Ireland, and have taken the opportunity of the expiration of the Peace Preservation Act to record their unswerving faith in the ultimate success of Mr. GLADSTONE's legislation. To those who regard the state of Ireland with ordinary impartiality, the same bland satisfaction is scarcely possible. No week passes without some horrible story of agrarian murder or outrage. The Land Act has been supplemented by the Arrears' Act; but the concessions thus made to agitation have not led to the restoration of order and tranquillity. The improvement that has taken place is due to the stern provisions of the last Coercion Act, and not to the mollifying influences of the famous remedial legislation. And it is upon the vigorous execution of exceptional laws that the Government in Ireland must long depend for the maintenance of the authority of the law. In the meantime, the Irish party is proceeding to devise its plans for the future Parliamentary campaign. The invitation of Mr. GLADSTONE to the Irish members to bring forward a definite scheme for the establishment of Irish Home Rule is likely to be complied with. Mr. PARNELL's policy of agitation, supported by disorder and outrage, will scarcely be abandoned so long as Mr. GLADSTONE remains in a position to justify it by the concession of its demands.

In an exceptionally able and telling speech delivered in Radical Glasgow Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE has pointed out how little cause for congratulation the Government has in the present position of public affairs. Notwithstanding the loud expressions of faith on the part of interested partisans, there is no reason to believe that the Government has acquired any permanent accession of popularity or confidence by the success of the English arms in Egypt. Ministers have alienated the sympathy of a not inconsiderable section of their Radical followers. And they have naturally not conciliated the support of Conservatives who see in the present adoption of a patriotic policy no satisfaction for the blunders of the past, and no security against the follies of the future. Those who oppose the Ministry are not likely to abandon their opposition, because on one question the Government has shown itself in harmony with the national sentiment. Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE opportunely reminded men how wide are the issues of the struggle of parties at present. The Tory party has for its actual duty the defence of the liberties of the English people. Freedom of speech, freedom of contract, and freedom of opinion—these are the objects of the attacks of modern Radicalism, and it is to their maintenance that the energies of the Conservative party must be devoted. After all not even the triumph of Tel-el-Kebir will reconcile the English people to the surrender of their constitution al rights.

The Italian people may at the present time well abandon their intemperate discussion of foreign affairs, and devote political consideration exclusively to domestic matters. In the course of a few weeks, at the end of October or at the beginning of November, the first general election under the new electoral law will be held; and it is scarcely too much to say that the political future of Italy will be decided. Italy has taken a leap in the dark. Thus far the restricted franchise has limited to 700,000 voters the choice of the Italian Parliament. Under the new suffrage the number of voters will be not less than two millions. What the political complexion of the Chamber of Deputies elected by the enlarged constituencies will be, baffles all conjecture. *Scrutin de liste* has been introduced, as well as a system for the representation of minorities similar to that which exists in English three-cornered constituencies. It is believed that a large proportion of the present deputies will contrive to retain seats in the new Parliament. An endeavour has been made to unite the Left and Right of the present Parliament in one party that might appeal to the country with a common programme. The differences of political opinion are inconsiderable, but the divergence of personal interests has been fatal to a similar coalition. That Italian Republicanism will secure a larger share of the representation under the new system is held possible. But the Clerical party offers a greater danger to existing political parties. If the neutrality that the Vatican has hitherto imposed upon its adherents ceases; if the maxim of PIUS IX., "*Ne eletti ne elettori,*" is no longer acted upon; it is almost certain that under the fresh political conditions the Clerical party will be able to return to the new Chamber a body of representatives formidable not only by their enthusiasm and activity, but by their numbers.

That a large proportion of the papers read at the Derby Church Congress this week are well up to the average in point of ability and usefulness, no one can, we think, deny. Such an essay, for instance, as that on "Church "Courts," by the learned Canon of York, Dr. **Trevor**, is simply admirable. It may, without exaggeration, be said to mark an era in the discussion of that important question. And yet, in spite of the undeniable merits of the papers read, and the interesting character of the discussions, there is, we venture to say, a growing opinion among Churchmen that the practical utility of a Church Congress is, after all, not very great. In the first place, it is felt that what is wanted with reference to Church affairs is action, much more than talk, however learned or instructive the latter may be. There is a sense of unreality in meeting year after year to discuss the same more or less worn-out subjects, and yet to know that, in only a small number of instances, can any practical result follow. Discussion, of course, is a good thing; but only a good thing as clearing the way for action. Another unsatisfactory feature of the Congress is the extremely large number of subjects put down for discussion. The really valuable papers and speeches are, in fact, swamped by a mass of matter of inferior quality, to say nothing of the time wasted in paying mere compliments. There is, morever, some doubt as to whether the object which it was hoped Church Congresses would effect, of promoting unity in the Church, is in any way attained. As an eminent dignitary recently remarked, they only seem to bring out into greater prominence the irreconcilable differences which exist in the Church.

THE POLITICAL POSITION.

It is natural enough that the supporters of Mr. **Gladstone**'s Administration should display an exaggerated exultation at the successful issue of the Egyptian expedition. And it is not at all surprising that it should be loudly asserted that by its vigorous policy in Egypt the Government has regained the popularity, which it is now acknowledged was wholly lost, and that it has even made men forget and condone the long series of political crimes and blunders that filled the first two years of its existence. Noisy nonsense of this kind was to be looked for, and the opportunity to paint in glowing colours the portrait of Mr. **Gladstone**, like **George Washington**, first in peace, first in war, and first in the hearts of his countrymen, has certainly not been neglected by those interested in the adulation of the **Prime Minister**. But it is open to the gravest question whether the Egyptian war has really strengthened the Government, and there is little doubt that it has greatly depreciated Mr. **Gladstone** himself in popular opinion. The popular rejoicing over the triumphant results of the war must not be confounded with approbation of the policy which made the war necessary and inevitable. The national recognition and acceptance of the policy of the defence of the Imperial interests is in itself a rebuke and a repudiation of the impulsive politician who entered office pledged to a reversal of an Imperial policy. Mr. **Gladstone**'s action as Prime Minister has been the condemnation of his action as a leader of Opposition. The war in Egypt is the justification of the war in Afghanistan. The campaign in the valley of the Nile is the evidence of the profound political immorality that inspired the crusade in Midlothian.

Opportunely enough, Sir **Stafford Northcote** has, in the brilliant and effective speech that he delivered at Glasgow, called the attention of the English people to these obvious considerations of the present position. It has been said, it seems, by Radical partisans that the present is an unfortunate period for a Conservative leader to address the Conservative party. The exact opposite is the case. The present is a time for Conservative triumph. For Conservatives see in the policy the Radicals have pursued the victory of the principles that they advocate at present and a vindication of the course they pursued in the past. The genuine Radicals, the men who really believed in the honesty of Mr. **Gladstone** and the sincerity of his declarations, have every reason to reflect bitterly on the illusions that have been dissipated and the confidence that has been betrayed. Where is the Peace that they were ready to sacrifice everything for? Where is the Retrenchment that they held up as the most sacred duty of Government? Where are the Reforms that were to make England Utopia? It may well be doubted whether Mr. **Gladstone** has heightened his claims to the innocent veneration with which he was wont to be regarded by simple-minded Radicalism. And it is quite certain that he has strengthened the contemptuous hatred with which the majority of educated English people regard the **Prime Minister** by the fresh proofs and evidences afforded of the utterly hypocritical character of the sanctimonious denunciations of our Imperial policy with which he paved the way for his return to office and power. Sir **Stafford Northcote** alludes to the secret dissatisfaction that prevails in the Liberal party in consequence of the attitude that they have been compelled to take up. And he might have commented on the open contempt that is manifested outside the Liberal ranks for the conduct of a Minister who outrages the decencies and moralities of political life by pursuing in office a policy that he had overwhelmed with revilings whilst in Opposition. Mr. **Bright**, whose honesty and sincerity everyone admits and admires, has not refrained from suggesting his scorn for those who attempt to draw any distinction between the policy of the Egyptian war and the policy that dictated similar appeals to force on behalf of the national interests. Something more than the verbal follies in which Mr. **Gladstone** pleaded that the bombardment of Alexandria was resorted to in self-defence, and that England was really not waging war in Egypt at all, will be required to reconcile conscientious Radicals to the abandonment by the **Prime Minister** and the Government of their choice of all those principles that were so loudly exalted on so many platforms when it was a question of turning out the Government of Lord **Beaconsfield**.

In a few weeks the opportunity will come for the full discussion in Parliament of the Egyptian policy of the Ministry. Happily the *clôture* is not yet in force, or the Government might be tempted to put a swift limit to debates that cannot fail to be damaging. It will not be difficult to show that whilst the credit of bringing the war to a speedy and successful close belongs to Sir **Garnet Wolseley** and the army, the discredit of rendering the war necessary and inevitable belongs to Mr. **Gladstone** and the Government. A little energy in the beginning would have dissipated the danger of rebellion. But the Government hesitated and lingered. It did nothing, out of consideration for France, and out of consideration for the Concert of Europe. It called a Conference at Constantinople; it made foolish appeals for the armed assistance of other Powers; and all this time the danger increased in proportions, till at last the Egyptian expetion became imperative. And the English taxpayers will now have to pay for the tardiness and trepidation that alone enabled **Arabi Pasha** to organise rebellion. Probably Mr. **Gladstone** fears nothing quite so much in the settlement of the Egyptian question as the revelation to the English people of the cost of a war that men feel would have been averted by a wise and firm foreign policy. Such popularity as the war may have given to his Government the next Budget is, in fact, likely to scatter to the winds.

Correspondence.

THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

To the Editor of the John Bull.

Sir,—A little of the above congeries goes a long way, and were it not for the reporters, and Messrs. Bemrose's expected reproduction of the whole in print, it would indeed be a crude and undigested mass. I send you now a few *prima facie* impressions of what I have seen and heard at Derby. Despite the preliminary effusion of oil upon the waters by the President, who, by the way, gave us rather a strong dose of the "good Archbishop," which we swallowed *cum grano* in a personal and not archiepiscopal connection, and prayed for him as we were bid, and in duty bound—*malgré*, moreover, the vigorous greeting administered as a *bonne bouche* by our Liberal Primate's henchman, who singled out the *Church Times*, the *Rock*, and the *Record* for dishonourable mention as rancorous party newspapers (perhaps the *John Bull* escaped because it is "extreme" in Canon Furse's sense, viz., "thorough," and does not admit into its columns such personalities of a spiteful and oblique description as I heard spluttered forth amid vehement applause by more than one excited orator). The Church of the future, in which "burning questions shall have 'burnt themselves out,'" remains a vision of peace as yet unrealised.

A more or less rampant democracy is an increasing characteristic of Church Congresses. The "hair of the dog that bit you" nostrum is sonorously paraded by our Barrys and Plumptres. Democracy threatens: *ergo*, democratise the Church. Darwinism dogmatises: *ergo*, Darwinise theology. In another section, the ecclesiastical agitator appears as if backed against time, a very "galloping snob" of glib volubility, cramming the greatest possible number of words and gestures into the prescribed seven minutes. "This is also vanity," &c.—but perhaps the irrepressible element is a necessary infliction.

Canon Trevor's paper on Church Courts was delicious, but much of its effect is necessarily lost in print. One point deserves attention—"None have so good a right to complain as the old Anglicans." Mr. Green's friends were not wanting to the occasion: passive resistance and patient endurance are very different from active and violent agitation. Lord Nelson's clear paper vindicated "prelacy" from the aspersions cast upon it, by the "independency" school of High Churchmen. Bishops elected by the faithful are not guaranteed better than those nominated by the Crown. Of course all depends on the personal character of the Sovereign. Mr. Stanley Leighton sounded a trumpet-call which will not lightly be forgotten. Has the old battle-cry "the church in danger" been *quite* extinguished by the besotted optimism of the advocates of a "masterly inactivity?" I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

Barton-under-Needwood, October 5. R. H.

THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

(*Continued from page* 631.)

THURSDAY.

At the morning meeting in the Drillhall, the Bishop of **Lincoln** read a paper on "The Controversy with Rome."

The Rev. Dr. **Nevin**, chaplain of the American Church in Rome, in speaking on the same subject, said Papal Rome was giving up Christianity to doubt and unbelief, and she was the greatest obstacle to the advance of Christ's kingdom amongst civilised people.

The Rev. Canon **Curteis**, in reading a paper on "The Deficiencies of Dissent," observed that as Churchmen they thought a high and elaborate organisation better than a low one; but as Englishmen they had no fear whatever of a complex, vast, skilfully-differentiated polity. They held that the Scriptural metaphor of "the Body" of Christ abundantly justified them in facing all the acknowledged perils with bold handling of organisation. Some of these perils, for instance, that of government by caprice or by alien dictation, might possibly be escaped by small religious republics. Indeed, there were many curious indications that their Puritan brethren were gradually coming to agree with them on this question. (Hear, hear.) A still more important deficiency came into view amid the various interesting controversies that were going on between Churchmen and Dissenters. It seemed, though, that these controversies were to be settled offhand by an appeal to scripture texts, and so the Bible was degraded into a sort of arsenal for missiles. Puritanism, in short, had altogether placed itself in a false and untenable position by forgetting that the Lord left no New Testament behind him—no, not one written word—but only a Church. Owing to the defective conception of the Bible, and also owing to another deficiency, as Churchmen thought, a most exaggerated objection was raised by Puritan Nonconformists to establishment by the State. They thought it perilous to the Church, and so did they; they thought it involved considerable losses and surrenders, and so did they. The question was whether courage and enterprise were admirable so long as missions to savages were concerned, and lost all title to respect when they were directed upon the strongholds of the highest modern civilisation. The second type of Nonconformity was the Wesleyan type. And here they stood on perfectly different ground, for Methodism was the daughter of the Church of England; and so far as he could see there was no reason whatever why every Wesleyan class should not be enrolled to-morrow among the religious societies of that Church except that their own ministers do not desire it. There were positively only two points that would need mutual explanation. On one side the meaning of "sacraments," on the other the meaning of "conversion." They suspected that they meant by sacraments a superstitious system of external observances, leading towards formalism; and, on the other side, the Wesleyan doctrine of conversion, he took it, simply meant that redemption could not possibly be a matter of mere words and sacraments and rituals, but must be a soul-transforming reality. Now, was there a single Churchman there who did not, from the bottom of his heart, agree with all that? Why, then, erect that truism into a banner, and try to claim it as an exclusive possession? All reverence to men, who even in a crude form, carried so bravely into action that banner of the Gospel "the kingdom of God is not a word, but a power." Yet he thought they would do well to supplement their defective half-truth of conversion by the Church's whole truth of renewal. They would then begin to see the beauty of her conception, "the family of Jesus Christ" would refrain from pouring scorn on the baptismal birth thereinto, and of subsequent tranquil growth therein; would hesitate to plunge all without discrimination into paroxysms which undermine the powers of self-control, and so would make their half into the whole, and the Wesleyan doctrine into the doctrine of John Wesley and of the Church of England. The third and deeply interesting type of dissent was that which called itself Unitarian. The name was wholly misleading. Their claim was simply this: within the lines of a heart's loyalty to Christ, to enjoy an unrestricted freedom of the intellect. Their defect is surely here—that they failed to see how the Church's counter claim to authority was a purely educational one, and it was not meant to fetter thought in any way. Those that came to school with her must, of course, submit to her system, learn by her late schisms, get by heart her creeds, form themselves to prayer by her liturgy. This sort of submission was the ordinary demand of every teacher in the world. And even when the teaching was over, and the pupil went forth free, was it very much to ask that he should remain loyal to his old school and should forbear to express scorn for the methods pursued there? So long as there were "babes in Christ"—and that was always—must they not be taught by formula and symbol? The Church of England had been too lightly abandoned by men who ought to have placed their intellectual strength at her disposal, and who would have been repaid one-thousand fold in warmth of worship and in enlargement of heart. In these days thousands of good men were weary to death of sectarian strife. Thousands were seeking a haven for their storm-tossed souls, and a living shelter where their children shall be tenderly welcomed and gently won to God. And among men of science God alone knows how many yearn—as for a restful paradise—for a communion reformed from gross superstition, yet still lovely with beauty of worship, peaceful with holy order, and powerful—by symbolism rather than by preaching—to draw men to Christ while leaving them intellectually free. And such communion they maintained the Church of England to be. Let them, then, be loyal to her, and repair their own deficiencies. (Hear, hear.) Let them cease both from coquetting and from quarrelling with other religious bodies, but honour their services, acknowledge their political and social rights, and try to supply their deficiencies. And let their sole retaliation for any evil be this—to make their communion a blessing, even for them that hated her; and for all of their countrymen the boldest, grandest, and most helpful expression in this land of their best thoughts, of their highest aspiration. (Loud cheers.)

The Rev. Chancellor **Espin**, D.D., followed on the same subject. The idea of the Church as a visible organised society seemed almost lost among Dissenters. Their notion of the Church universal seemed to be that it was a sort of ant-hill swarming with a number of small independent existences. There was another particular in which the notion of the modern Dissenter at least was sadly deficient. He would have it that the State must be merely secular; that everything national shall be dissociated from religion. And yet if there be any principle in downright antagonism to the Bible, surely it was this. The Old Testament from end to end was pervaded by teaching that was plainly against the modern Dissenting doctrine. So also were the writings of their own divines up to the last half-century. And what could be more inconsistent than the notions of Dissenters on this matter? A man must serve God personally—a family must be religious; but a national religion, "Oh, that was adultery betwixt Church and State." Was God, then, the God of the man and of the family, and not of the nation? In several of the colonies all regular and official acknowledgment of religion has been put an end to. Elementary education was secular so far as the State was concerned. University education was much in the same predicament. Marriage was dissociated, in part at least, from Christianity. Then there was the divorce law, which was clearly against the law of Christ and the Church, whilst repeated attempts had been made to abolish the table of prohibitory degrees; for that was what marriage with a deceased wife's sister really meant. Was this great and ancient English nation on the high road towards a collective and corporate repudiation of the Gospel? Let them not forget, however, that whatever they might think of the deficiencies of Dissent, very much Dissent was directly due to deficiencies in the Church. For some of these no doubt the Dissenters themselves were rapidly taking over the main responsibility. When in all these dioceses and in all these parishes the Church bore on her plain tokens of superior unity, truth, sanctity, authority; when all their churches could show as compared with the chapels more frequent and more devout services; when there was heard from all our pulpits more searching, affectionate, and truly evangelical preaching; when the vicarages were tenanted by more strict-living, laborious, and faithful pastors—then there would come out one more deficiency of Dissent which at present did not exist—the deficiency of numbers. (Applause.)

The Bishop of **Nelson** next read a paper on the possibilities of reunion or inter-communion. He said he approached the subject after 15 years' experience in the colonies, where there was no State Church, and his views of other communions might be somewhat affected thereby. He proposed to discuss the subject assigned him by answering the two questions: (1) Was it possible for the Church to be united again with those communions to which it formerly belonged or which belonged to it? and (2) what amount of inter-communion could there be between the Church, their Church, and other communions? In answer to the first question he said, decidedly not. Bishop Jewel's apology remained not unanswered but undecided, and if they needed any more reasons for not joining the Church of Rome Dr. Littledale had given them. In theory, union with the Greek Church was more feasible than with Rome; they had not so many fundamentals as Rome had. Practically, however, he saw no immediate prospect of such union. Uniformity in the external organisation of the Church was not in accordance with the mind of God so far as they could judge of Him from His word, and from nature. Substantial unity might be attained in the midst of great variety, and such unity was the more valuable when it existed in the midst of great variety. A catholic religion must be in its very nature of the simplest form, and should contain as few essentials as possible. Nearly all their troubles had come from multiplying fundamentals, and thus binding upon their brethren a burden which they and their fathers were not able to bear. He urged that the Bishops should be increased in number, should co-operate with the presbyters, and the deacons should be more than apprentice priests—(hear, hear)—if they wanted to be like the Apostolic Church. (Hear, hear.) The Church had the Holy Spirit promised to her, and he did not see why she should not be able to rearrange her own organisation. He now came to intercommunion with such bodies as the French, German, and Swiss Protestants, and the Presbyterians, Wesleyan, Baptist, and Congregational Churches. Let them be grateful to those communions for what they had done, for this it was that had awakened and stimulated their energies, and saved Church and England from much bloodguiltiness. ("No, no," and cheers.) Well, Dissent had given them a *Pilgrim's Progress*, a Baxter's *Saints' Rest*, and other works. If, then, they wanted to reunite those bodies they must supply the deficiency which was the plea for their defection. ("No, no," and cheers.) They must check the growth of prelacy, develop the functions of the presbytery, and they must quicken the sense of spiritual life. He argued that the episcopal ordination of those who had been Presbyterian might be conducted at a different time and place, and would not require the same kind of public certificate as the other. Then surely they might allow such men, under certain circumstances, to preach in their churches—("No, no")—as they would allow Churchmen. Let them, however, guard jealously the reformed character of their Church. (Cheers.) Ought they to make the Episcopacy absolute or essential for others? He believed the moment they ceased to enforce it, that moment it would cease to be obnoxious, and it would speedily become acceptable. (Laughter and cheers.) In the colonies they always admitted to Holy Communion the communicants of other religious bodies. If they were to have intercommunion they must provide for the variety of men's tastes. (No, no.) There must be a desire to win over Nonconformists; there must be a great reform in their preaching. There could be no bad preachers among the Dissenters, their circumstances would not allow of it. Do not, however, let them over-much deplore their unhappy divisions, and so make them appear more than they really were. They heard that a Presbyterian had been appointed to read over a prepared sermon by a Methodist with a Churchman, with the view of seeing if it was one suitable to be printed in Japan by the Religious Tract Society. (Laughter.) They could approach to intercommunion by co-operation, and by this means they could co-operate in many things. But if they could not go so far as he had advocated towards union and inter-communion, they must remember this—His disciples came to Our Lord and said when they saw one casting out devils in His name, "We forbade him because he followed Thee not." "Forbid him not," said Christ, "for there is no man that can do a miracle in My name that can lightly speak evil of Me, and he that is not against us is on our side." (Cheers.)

Earl Nelson was of opinion that a multiplication of fundamentals of belief would be a mistake against union or reunion. They ought to be very grateful for what Nonconformists had done. (Hear, hear.) He would advocate that special services for the purpose of promoting reunion should be held in their churches, and if that were done he believed the practice would very soon be imitated in the Dissenting chapels. Any scheme of corporate reunion would, in his mind, be premature, and, therefore, it was waste of time discussing it much at the present time. There was one other caution he would give. There was no difficulty in regard to the desire of a number of Nonconformist ministers to become ministers in the Church of England; but some people, knowing that, thought it very important for reunion that we should immediately have some scheme of scholarship, or other provision, for those candidates during the two years of their preparation. In some cases, no doubt, that might be done, but in others it would be attended with considerable danger. It might sap the discipline of the Nonconformist bodies, which as they knew imposed considerable trials of a man's sincerity, whilst they might run the risk of flooding the Church and its order with the worst men from the Nonconformist ministry. (Hear, hear.) He did not think they should despair of reunion, but there was a great deal to be done before it could be brought about. If there was to be a real reunion, the Church must fearlessly maintain her own faith, at the same time being ready to give an answer to Nonconformists in a true spirit of love. The Church should heartily recognise all that was good in the sects and all the good that was being done by them; the Church should be careful to learn from the weakness of Nonconformists her own shortcomings, and so promote a spirit of zeal for their common Master's work. If this were done, he believed that in a very short period the possibilities of reunion would have been wonderfully increased. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. A. R. Fawcett agreed with the Bishop of Lincoln in his remarks as to the necessity of unity of belief, and that the strength of Rome lay in the chisms of Protestants. So long as Rome was not at peace with God, he joined with all those who said, "No peace with Rome." The Church of England impugned the Church of Rome for her idolatry, and he did. He proceeded to speak of the "legalised guardians of a piece of bread as a species of idolatry," but was met with an uproar of dissentient voices.

The President asked those who might wish to express disapprobation to do so in a manner such as would command respect amongst Christian gentlemen. (Cheers.)

The Rev. A. R. Fawcett concluded his remarks amid continued interruption.

Mr. Sidney Gedge, alluding to a breach between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, said the Church of Rome would not come nearer to them, they could not in any way go nearer to the Church of Rome, and even if they could there would be no use in their doing so. The Church of Rome differed from them in doctrine, but agreed with them in the point of episcopacy, and the question came to be which was to be of the greater importance, the lamp-post or the light? They would, he thought, agree with him that it was the light.

The Rev. Francis Lynes (Father Ignatius), who appeared in monastic garb, wearing the crucifix and with shaven head, was called upon by the President to speak. The one unique divinely given sign of the second coming of Christ, he said, had raised its head in our midst, and it was that tone of the 19th century civilisation which was tending towards the denial of all that was called good. His one question was this, did they acknowledge Jesus Christ as their God, and their one and only efficient and free salvation?—(hear, hear)—and if the Roman Catholic said "Yes, certainly," then he said there was an end of controversy between them. As to the controversy with Dissent he would take the same ground. The one great difficulty that they had with regard to their Church was that there was not one-half of their clergy that could say in the words of Christ that they had been converted and became as little children, and lay their hands upon their hearts and say, "I know that I have eternal life." They could not say that. One in twenty would be a fair per-centage of those who could say, "God has revealed His Son in me and sent me to preach." All the Bishops in the world could not make an evangelical preacher now, but the Holy Spirit could do that. He had come there not to speak for the Church of England, but for the sake of Jesus Christ in the Church—(cheers)—and he said this, that that Church which brushed away the rubbish from the Rock, which was Christ, that was the Church which would be uppermost in the day of the Lord, whether it be the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England, or the Salvation Army. (Cheers.)

After a few remarks from the Rev. Charles Gore,

The President said: I should have greatly desired to have said a few words before concluding our meeting, but after your time has been so admirably occupied by the interesting address which you have heard, I do not think it would be right to detain you longer than a very few minutes. You will all agree with me, I think, when I state, after the very interesting and full discussion that we have had, how much I regret that so much spiritual power as is treasured in the Church of Rome, and so much spiritual earnestness as was working in the ranks of Nonconformity, is separated from us in the struggle with which we are more than ever face to face in our day. I mean the struggle against sin and indifference to be found every day around us. Therefore let us all join in the resolution and the prayer that nothing shall be wanting on our part to break down the barriers between us and our Christian brethren, so far as it is possible to do so with loyalty to our blessed Lord Himself. (Cheers.) I believe that it is the key-note of our conference that we are all of us moved by the one spirit and longing after the being brought into closer fellowship with all who love our Lord, and the drift of every paper and address that we have heard to-day has been, if possible, to find out some, not only *modus vivendi*, but *modus operandi*, with those separated from us. May God indeed prosper our deliberations this morning towards some practical means by which we may be more united together in the great work which our Lord has given us to do in our Church—to overcome the power of evil, and to further the cause of God! (Cheers.) I now desire to make an intimation which I am sure will give satisfaction to many present. You will have read that the Bishop of Manchester has taken a step with reference to the unhappy imprisonment of which we have heard so much, and which I earnestly trust may be the means of putting an end to, and at last set free, that clergyman from his eighteen months' bondage. (Cheers.) And whatever may be our opinion as to the course of conduct of that clergyman himself, or of the course of conduct of those through whose proceedings he has been so long in prison, there is not one of my brethren on this platform who does not rejoice to see the prison doors thrown open and the prisoner free. (Cheers.) I earnestly trust that nothing will interpose to hinder this act of the Bishop of Manchester from bearing the fruits which he himself so earnestly desires, for he says—"I am most anxious that no act or omission of mine should in any way contribute to the imprisonment of Mr. Green or hinder his liberation." (Cheers.)

The meeting closed with prayer.

We are compelled to hold over several Papers which are in type—namely, that of the Bishop of Lincoln, Mr. Bereshope-Hope, Dr. F. Pigou, the Rev. G. Venables, the Rev. Canon Dixon, the Rev. W. W. English, the Hon. Wilbraham Egerton, M.P., the Rev. Canon Jelf, and the Rev. W. H. Hutchins.

LITERARY AND OTHER NOTES.

Messrs. George Bell and Sons have nearly ready a little volume of *Mission-room Addresses*, by Charles Mackeson, with a preface by the Right Hon. Earl Nelson. The addresses were given by Mr. Mackeson at St. Saviour's Mission-room, South Hampstead, and may be regarded as a fruit of the recent movement in the Church to utilise the efforts of laymen who, as "readers" commissioned by the Bishops, are authorised to conduct services in mission-rooms or other unconsecrated buildings. The Archbishop of Canterbury has accepted the dedication of the volume.

All animal life is not subject to death, according to the American *Journal of Science.* Examining through a microscope one of those minute single-cell creatures known as a protozoon, the *Journal* remarks that we see it expanding into an ellipsoidal figure, which becomes for a time longer and longer. It then begins to contract about what we may, for the sake of popular intelligibility, call its equator. It assumes the form of two nearly globular bodies, connected, dumb-bell-like, by a narrow neck. This neck becomes narrower, and at last the two globes are set free, and appear as two individuals in place of one. What are the relations of these two beings to the antecedent form and to each other? We examine them with care; they are equal in size, alike in complexity, or rather simplicity, of structure. We cannot say that either of them is more mature or more rudimentary than the other. We can find in their separation from each other no analogy to the separation of the young animal or the egg from its mother, or to the liberation of a seed from a plant. Neither of them is parent, and neither offspring. Neither of them is older or younger than the other. The process of reproduction, or rather of multiplication, must, so far as we can see, be repeated in the same manner for ever. Accidents excepted, they are immortal, and frequent as such accidents must be, the individuals whom they strike might, or rather would, like the rest of their community, have gone on living and splitting themselves up for ever. It is strange, when examining certain infusoria under the microscope, to consider that these frail and tiny beings were living not potentially in their ancestors, but really in their own persons, perhaps in the Laurentian epoch.

An amusing instance of Chinese cowardice is furnished by Mr. Baber. A Customs officer was explaining to him that a band of twenty to thirty Lolos, armed with sticks and stones, had swooped down on the village and carried off about £200, besides stripping all the officers of their clothes; whereupon Mr. Baber remarked it was a shameful thing that a village containing one hundred and fifty able-bodied men could not protect itself against thirty Lolos armed only with sticks and stones; to which his visitor rejoined, with true Chinese *naiveté*:—

"Certainly it is very shameful, but how can you expect mere savage Lolos to have any sense of shame? What is still more disgraceful, the robbers were subject Lolos and not the autonomous Blackbones. The latter would have plundered us and carried us into slavery as well!"

Dr. Schliemann is suffering from a malarious fever, contracted during his excavations in the Troad last winter. He is at Marienbad, in Bohemia, drinking the waters.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

FRANCE.—Several cases of Asiatic cholera have occurred, according to the *Télégraphe*, at Modane, on the French side of the Mont Cenis Tunnel. The mail bags are consequently to be disinfected, and a commission of doctors and chemists has arrived to make an investigation.

M. Grévy on Wednesday morning invested Monseigneur Czacki with the Cardinal's hat. The usual ceremonial was observed. The President sent his carriage for the Nuncio, who is still in a very weak condition, and had to be supported by two of his suite. A second carriage conveyed his chief subordinates. At the steps of the Elysée the Nuncio was received by a battalion of infantry and the President's military household, and a detachment of soldiers escorted him to the saloon. There M. Grévy with M. Duclerc, the Premier, and M. Fallières, Minister of the Interior and Worship, received him. Monseigneur Czacki then exchanged the violet robe for the red robe, purple cassock, and red cap, after which he attended mass in the Elysée chapel. M. Grévy, in accordance with his usual custom, was not present at the service, but his military household and a few ladies attended it. The Nuncio then returned to the saloon, where Monseigneur Ferrata, Ablegate, read the Latin bull raising him to the Cardinalate. Monseigneur Ferrata expressed his gratification at having a second time been intrusted by the Pope with such a duty, and he delivered a eulogium on the Nuncio and on the President. He described the elevation of the Nuncio to the Cardinalate as a fresh pledge of the Pope's affection for the French nation, sketched the Nuncio's distinguished ancestry and virtues, and referred to the expressions of sympathy and of regret at his departure which reached him on all sides. He implored God to preserve the Nuncio for many years for the good of the Church, and he also implored God to load with prosperity and happiness the President and this very Christian nation, which his own instincts as also the new Cardinal's example led him to love tenderly.

The Nuncio then said that it was to time-honoured custom he owed the honour of being created a Cardinal at the close of his mission. The satisfaction he felt, however, was much diminished by the thought that he was about to leave France. Among all classes of this great nation he had met with a reception which had proved to him that those with whom he had had relations regarded him as a true friend of France voluntarily sacrificing all his strength to her glory. He had seen that the President, with his lofty intelligence, had appreciated his efforts, whose sole object was to give France the benefit of the enlighterment of the greatest moral authority in this world. He thanked the President for having more than once lightened his arduous task. It had been a happiness to him to work for the good of the Church of France—that glory of the past and that real honour to present times—whose only desire was to gladden its country by diffusing the teachings of religion. Unable to work any further for France or to otherwise testify his gratitude, he would not fail during the few days that probably still remained to him to pray for France and for the President in order that God might guide and protect them. He concluded by begging the President, when he should be far away or no more, to cherish a recollection of him.

The President replied:—

> Monsieur le Cardinal,—It is not merely in obedience to tradition that the Holy Father has raised you to this dignity, but because you are, as the Ablegate has so well said in that fine Latin language which he knows how to revivify, gifted with the most perfect and most valuable qualities. You have, with a rare spirit of conciliation, discerned the true interests of the Church and upheld them, and France, whom you love, reciprocates your sentiments. For myself, since you lay store by my remembrance, be assured that it will always follow you as a man who has inspired me with the deepest sympathy.

The President then invested the Nuncio with the *barrette*, as also with the ensigns of Commander of the Legion of Honour. The Nuncio's health precluded him from accepting the customary breakfast, and he was escorted back to the Nunciature with the same ceremonial.

A duel was fought on Wednesday in the Bois de Boulogne between M. Meyer, the director of the *Gaulois*, and M. Gaston Dreyfus, son of the well-known banker, M. Isidore Dreyfus. The quarrel which led to this appeal to the sword originated in a discussion which took place at the Bourse on Tuesday. M. Dreyfus objected to an ironical paragraph concerning certain legal restraints which had been put on the rather lavish expenditure of his brother, and after high words had been freely exchanged between him and M. Meyer, M. Dreyfus raised his hand and struck the director of the *Gaulois* a violent blow. The issue of the duel was unfavourable to M. Meyer, who was wounded in the chin, though not seriously.

The suicide of a young lady who threw herself off the upper exterior gallery of Notre Dame caused immense sensation in that quarter of the city on Wednesday. The young lady, who is described as elegantly dressed and about twenty years of age, showed great determination in the accomplishment of her design. At nine o'clock in the morning she requested to be allowed to visit the Tower, but was refused, as no lady is permitted to make the ascent alone. Though disappointed she did not give up her fatal project, but wandering about the Cathedral succeeded in scraping acquaintance with an elderly woman, whom she invited to breakfast with her at a restaurant, and there prevailed on her to accompany her up the Tower. It was at two o'clock that they presented themselves at the foot of the stairs, and were permitted to ascend. When they had reached the upper gallery it was raining in torrents. The old woman ran to take shelter in the bellringers' room, which, however, she had scarcely reached before her young companion had with a piercing cry precipitated herself from a height of sixty mètres into the street below. She fell on the railings, and was literally cut in two. Her identity has not yet been established. She was not suffering from want, as 5f. 50c. was found in her purse. The elderly lady who had consented to accompany her is said to have disappeared.

The suit brought by the Sisterhood of St. Vincent de Paul against the Prefect of the Seine for having, as they allege, illegally expelled them from their school premises in the Rue de la Lune came on for hearing on Wednesday before the Civil Tribunal of the Seine. The case was referred to a special audience of the Court held yesterday (Friday).

EGYPT.—The *Standard's* correspondent telegraphs a long account of the review which took place at Cairo on Saturday. He says:—

"The square in front of the Abdin Palace presented a brilliant appearance. Upon one side was a long wooden pavilion, gaily decorated. In the centre was the dais of the Khedive. The Sultan's flag flew overhead, the Royal standard of England was on the right, the Egyptian flag on the left. The pavilion was filled with Europeans and Egyptian officials, very few unofficial natives having a place there. Opposite, with a space between for the march of the troops, was the general's staff, with a body-guard of marines, in bright red coats and white trousers. General Wolseley took up his place in front of the Khedive's raised dais.

"At four o'clock the march-past began. At the head of the cavalry division rode General Drury-Lowe with his staff; his handling of his troops during the war places him on the roll of distinguished cavalry leaders. Borradaile's Battery of Horse Artillery had the place of honour. After the Horse Artillery came the stately Household Cavalry, with drawn swords, in sections of fours, all at a steady trot, looking in their fighting kit very different from, but certainly no less effective than, the gorgeous cavalry who file before the Queen at Windsor. Scarcely inferior in size of men or horses were the 4th and 7th Dragoon Guards. Following these came the 19th Hussars, perhaps the most smartly turned out body of cavalry upon the ground. Following the Hussars came the Mounted Infantry, rifles at rest. From the 5th of August until the end of the war this little body has been in almost daily conflict with the enemy. In every fight they were the first to begin and the last to finish. The Indian Cavalry next filed past, a splendid and picturesque body, the curved swords of the 2nd and 6th Bengal Cavalry flashing in the sun, and the pennons of the 13th Lancers making a gay show. Their array was no whit less steady and disciplined than that of the best English horsemen, and the effect of the spectacle on the Egyptians in the pavilion and upon the crowds in the square was very marked. After the cavalry, thirty guns of the Horse Artillery—no finer could be seen in the world—rumbled through the square, their quiet, business-like look being all the more effective after the gay show of the Indian horsemen.

"The bands, which had hitherto been playing a lively cavalry trot, now changed the time, and a march heralded the approach of the blue-jacket contingents, that from Ismailia under Captain Fitzroy, that from Alexandria—chiefly the men who had done good service in the armour-clad train—under Commander Henderson. The blue-jackets have done brilliant service during this war in a great variety of ways. Upon the present occasion they proved that in a march-past they can rival the most perfectly drilled infantry; and a German officer who was present included them as amongst the best troops on the ground. Next to them came the garrison and marine artillery under Colonel Tewson.

"The appearance of the Duke of Connaught with his staff now indicated the approach of the Brigade of Guards. No need to criticise their marching, as, with ranks closely locked, they passed in solid column to the 'British Grenadiers' March.' The leading company of the Scots Guards attracted special admiration, the men averaging 6ft. 2in. in height, certainly the highest average in the British army; and the whole brigade is a remarkably fine one. After the Guards the steady stream of British infantry flowed past in unbroken order, the regiments deploying into column as they entered the square, forming column of route at the double as they emerged from the narrow streets with perfect and unvarying discipline. After the Guards came the 18th (Royal Irish), the 50th (West Kent), the 84th (York and Lancaster), and the 87th (Irish Fusiliers). The battalion of Royal Marines followed in new red tunics and brilliantly white helmets, the troops quite eclipsing in appearance all which had passed before, and presenting a splended spectacle. The marines completed the line of the First Division.

"General Willis, whose wound has quite healed, now left the side of the Commander-in-Chief and followed his division, and General Hamley and his staff approached. The drums and bagpipes next heralded the coming of General Alison's Highland Brigade. When the detailed reports of the battle of Tel-el-Kebir, now on their way home, are received, I think that it will be allowed that the advance of this brigade will be considered as one of the finest instances of military discipline, under the trying circumstances of a night's march, in our military history. The Black Watch went past to the tune of 'Highland Laddie.' Since Fontenoy, when this regiment covered the retreat of the English army, this regiment has taken part in nearly every event in British military history. After the Black Watch the Cameronians strode past to the 'Pibroch of Donald Dhu,' which has been heard upon the scene of many a British victory. The first man who surmounted the entrenchments of Tel-el-Kebir was Private Donald Cameron, of this regiment, who fell dead, shot through the head. The Gordon Highlanders and the 74th, equal in physique and appearance to the leading regiments, completed the brigade. Then came the Fourth Brigade from Alexandria, led by General Sir Evelyn Wood, upon whose breast glittered three lines of medals. The 60th Rifles completed the march past of the Second Division.

"The Indian Contingent, under Generals Macpherson and Tanner, finished the display. The 72nd (the Seaforth Highlanders) headed the division, nearly every man wearing the Afghan medal and Candahar cross, and these were generally pronounced by the spectators to be the finest body of men upon the ground. The wiry seasoned soldiers looked, indeed, almost a different race of men to the comparative youths of most of the other corps. The 20th Punjaubees, almost entirely Sikhs and Afghans, and the 2nd Belooches well represented the Imperial Indian Army. The latter regiment, in its red Zouave trousers and green tunics, with long hair and tall, square-built figures, had a particularly warlike mien and attracted the admiration of all onlookers.

"But little sign of feeling was manifested by the crowds in the streets, who watched the display in gloomy silence. The great majority of the population probably view with a sense of relief the end of the war, but it is certainly not the case that their sympathies are with us, or with the Khedive whom the troops have brought back.

"Much of the credit for the success of the review must be given to Major-General Dormer, who had the chief arrangement of it. The passing of 17,000 troops through the narrow streets and small square without a single halt or hitch was a vastly more difficult matter than that of getting four times the number ranged in review order in Hyde Park."

The entire march past took exactly one hour and a half. There were in all 781 officers, 17,266 men, 4,320 horses, and sixty guns.

The *Times* understands that it has been decided to bring a certain number of native officers and non-commissioned officers from the Indian regiments which have served in Egypt to visit England. They will be presented to the Queen and receive the Egyptian war medal from her hands. The Cairo correspondent of the *Daily News*, telegraphing on Tuesday says :—

"Fifty men from each regiment of the Indian contingent left this morning for Alexandria, to be shown the war-ships. This is more sensible than the order, since countermanded, to march the whole contingent to see the Pyramids. The Sepoy is incapable of realising the sentiment awakened by such monuments. Even an intelligent, prosperous colonial merchant of Geelong lately assured me that he would not spend a guinea on Pompey's Pillar, and that, given enough stone, an Antipodean mason could make a better column in four weeks. I don't see that much good can come of the present arrangement of sending one native officer and one soldier from each regiment to England, so that like Jung Bahadoor they may stand on London-bridge and be properly impressed. My suggestion that a company from each regiment should go has been heartily approved by several commanding officers. If worth doing at all, it is worth doing well. Great numbers of people are expected to attend the inspection of the Indian contingent by the Duke of Connaught to-morrow morning. The Khedive expresses a wish to see the Lancers at tent-pegging and other Indian games in which this fine regiment excels."

INDIA.—A Calcutta telegram to the *Times*, dated Sunday, says :—

"The three Salvationists charged before the stipendiary magistrate in Bombay with being members of an unlawful assembly were convicted on Thursday last and fined, "Major" Tucker Rs. 50 and his two "lieutenants" Rs. 25 each. They all declined to pay the fine. Tucker, in consequence, was sentenced to a fortnight and the other two to one week of simple imprisonment. In the course of a careful judgment, the magistrate said that there was evidence on record that since the arrival of the Salvationists there had been a stir in the Mahommedan community, and from what had come to his knowledge he was of opinion that processions of this description were calculated to cause a disturbance of the public peace. The conditions of society in England and in India were quite different. In England the people professed one religion, and efforts like those of the Salvationists to reclaim the fallen would meet with universal sympathy ; but when they came to India to convert people from one faith to another they must avoid noisy and peculiar demonstrations, as these were sure to excite angry feelings and passions and to provoke counter-demonstrations. The British Government in India has been justly esteemed for its strict neutrality towards all classes of its subject races. If the Salvationists desired to preach Christianity they would be allowed to do so with perfect freedom, provided they selected some unobjectionable place ; but they could not be allowed to parade the streets in such a manner as would be calculated to excite the religious feelings of other sects, and so bring the people of different creeds into collision."

VICTORIA.—O'Farrell, the man who fired at Archbishop Goold, has been committed for trial. The injury inflicted on his Grace was very slight. It is stated that O'Farrell had long entertained a grudge against him on account of an equity suit.

The victory of the Australian cricketers over an Eleven of England has given the greatest satisfaction to the colonials.

The gold industry shows a considerable revival. The prospects of the crops are favourable.

IRELAND UNDER MR. GLADSTONE.

Michael Walsh (brother of Patrick Walsh, who was lately hanged at Galway for murder) was found guilty, after a three days' trial at Dublin, of being an accessory to the murder of Constable Kavanagh, at Letterfrack. The jury, recommended the prisoner to mercy on the ground of his youth, and Mr. Justice Lawson sentenced him to death.

Mr. Gray, M.P., who was sentenced to three months' imprisonment and fined £500 by Mr. Justice Lawson for contempt of Court, about six weeks ago, was released from prison on Saturday, at the close of the Special Commission, on payment of the fine, the Judge intimating that attempts to interfere with the course of justice had ceased.

A hurricane raged over the greater part of Ireland on Sunday, causing great damage. At Limerick trees were uprooted, chimney-stacks brought down, gas-lamps twisted from their posts, and several buildings more or less demolished. About eleven o'clock, just when the congregation were assembled, a portion of the newly-completed spire of St. John's Roman Catholic Cathedral was blown down. There was a scene of great excitement among the congregation ; but, fortunately, the masonry fell on to the road. One of the large stones came through the roof, but hurt no one. In the rush of the congregation to the door one woman is said to have had her arm fractured. At Ballinasloe the roofs of the Roman Catholic and Protestant churches, and of the Post-office were blown off, and many houses were also unroofed. Mrs. Kennedy, wife of the manager of the Bank of Ireland, had her arm broken. At Haydon's Hotel the chimney fell through the roof, severely injuring the proprietor and the cook. The injury done at Garbally, the residence of the Earl of Clancarty, is very great. At Newry the roof of a house was blown off, and many chimneys demolished. An extraordinary high tide burst the sewers in the low-lying parts of the town, and flooded the streets and the basements of the houses. The ships in the harbour were much damaged. During the celebration of nine o'clock mass a great part of the roof of the Franciscan Church at Kilkenny was blown away. The congregation were greatly alarmed ; but owing to the persuasion of the officiating clergyman they kept their places. A large number of trees were torn from their roots in the grounds of the Earl of Kenmare. A Cork telegram says that the gale, which commenced before midnight on Saturday, continued until Sunday afternoon to sweep over the south coast of Ireland ; and though no wrecks are yet reported, it is feared some serious shipping casualties have occurred. Inland, considerable destruction of property has taken place. The glass roof of Mallow Junction has been blown away, and a panic was caused at St. Luke's Church amongst the congregation owing to a window being blown in.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE AT GLASGOW.

On Wednesday evening Sir Stafford Northcote addressed a mass meeting of members of the Glasgow Conservative Association in St. Andrew's Hall, between 3,000 and 4,000 persons being present. The chair was occupied by Sir Archibald Campbell, of Blytheswood, and, in addition to Sir Stafford Northcote, those accommodated with seats on the platform were the Duke of Montrose, the Earl of Glasgow, the Earl of Dalkeith, the Earl of Galloway, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, Sir John Hay, M.P., Colonel Alexander, M.P., Mr. A. J. Balfour, M.P., Mr. Gorst, M.P., Sir Michael Shaw Stewart, Sir Graham Montgomery, and Mr. Charles Dalrymple, M.P.

Sir **Stafford Northcote**, who on rising was received with loud and prolonged cheering, after assuring those present of the satisfaction he felt at the reception he had met with, said that since he came to Glasgow the day before, he had heard from friends and seen in some organs of public opinion that he was announced to address the Conservatives of Glasgow at an unfortunate moment—(cries of "No, no")—because the Government at present were at the height of their popularity in consequence of the success which they had achieved in Egypt. Well, he repudiated that, and if at the bottom of such warnings and such comments as those there lay any idea that the Conservatives could prefer party triumphs to the interest of the country, he thought he for one would rather cut his connection with them. They were Britons first and Conservatives afterwards, and it could never be said of them that they were disposed to think meanly, or to detract from the success of their country, because those successes were won by their opponents. It seemed to him that that was a moment at which it was peculiarly incumbent upon all the constituencies of this country to endeavour to reflect upon the state of affairs, and to take counsel with themselves and with their party as to the real course of the Government in these matters. He was quite ready to rejoice with every one at the gallant conduct of our soldiers and our sailors. (Cheers.) But there were departments of the Government upon whose conduct he thought it much less easy at the present moment to pronounce a final judgment. He feared, when they came carefully to analyse the conduct of our Foreign Department and of the Government generally, they should seek to throw no inconsiderable responsibility upon them for having brought about a war which he believed was unnecessary and unjustifiable. (Cheers.) They must bear in mind that in their action in Egypt they had to consider the interests of India and of the connection between this island and its dependency there. It was not only of the highest importance that that communication should be maintained, but that also the great force of opinion which enabled them to rule that mighty mass of people should not be weakened. (Cheers.) He knew they heard it said there was the greatest difference in the world between the Liberal Government wars and the Conservative wars. The Conservative Government wars were those of annexation, and those of the Liberals were all the seven virtues. (Laughter.) It was just as easy to say the recent war had been a bondholders' war as to say that the last Conservative war was an annexation war. But the war in which the Government had been engaged was not a bondholders' war, and equally did he repudiate on the part of the late Government the charge that the wars they were unfortunately obliged to undertake were wars of annexation. (Cheers.) The result of all this policy in Egypt, taken as a whole, was this—they had exactly brought about in that country now the very state of things which their policy from the first was directed to prevent. They had opened up many questions which would be difficult to settle, and it lay with the Government what policy they now intended to pursue. Then they might take for granted it was not a case in which they could go back simply to the state of things immediately before the troubles in Egypt began. He did not believe that could be done in any department of human affairs. Therefore, it was of the highest importance they should take counsel together, and that the Government should treat them with confidence, frankness, and candour, and tell them what it was they really now aimed at, and what they expected to accomplish in Egypt. (Cheers.) Many people had so implicit a confidence in the Prime Minister that they could trust him in everything. (Laughter.) Mr. Gladstone had acquired one very fatal habit, and had kept it all through his life, and that was to put himself in untenable positions, and then have to retire from them. (Laughter.) That was very bad as regards the individual himself, but it was worse when he put the country in an untenable position. There were reasons why they should be cautious indeed with regard to what was coming next. Although there was great glory in the newspapers, and speeches made by the junior members of the Government, yet he believed it was the case that in many quarters there was a good deal of secret and underground dissatisfaction in the Liberal party as to the position the leaders had taken up. (Hear, hear.) The Government had failed, and remarkably failed, as a whole in performing that which the constituencies of the country expected them to perform when they placed them in office. Where were the great things which they promised the country, when they abused the late Government for doing no work, and when they came forward with peace, retrenchment, and reform? What had become of all that? Peace! Well, he would not speak about that. (Laughter.) The income tax had formerly been 5d., now it was 6½d., and even that levy would not be able to pay the expenditure to which the Government had gone. He wished them to bear in mind that the fact of these great victories and triumphs of the Government would have the effect of almost certainly enticing them to bring forward measures of a formidable character. The first thing they were going to do was to put a gag upon the liberty of speech of the Opposition in the House of Commons. They had, of course, an enormous majority in the House of Commons ; but somehow or other they could not get on without putting a tolerable and effective gag upon the Opposition speaking in the House of Commons. The Opposition would require to be prepared to meet in Parliament this question when it opened. (Cheers.) They heard a great deal about partnerships, and the effects of party in political life. There were some to whom party was everything, and there were others who took a wholly different view of it, but said that party feelings and party spirit led men to be narrow and unjust, and gave them an altogether unsound and unfair view of political life and of the real interests of the country. They must not cry down party spirit ; they must take care it did not lead them into narrow, and, he might say, into base courses ; they must be fair, and they must endeavour themselves to fight the battle fairly, and they must also try to get all those who were opposed to them to fight it fairly. They were not to gain the day by unfair means, but they were to hold up to the people of this country the true Conservative standard—a standard such as would rally round it all men who had the interest of their country at heart. (Cheers.) If he might venture to choose a word which should be inscribed on the banner of the Conservatives when they were fighting, the word he would select would be "Freedom." (Cheers.) Freedom of speech, no *clôtures*—freedom of contract—(cheers)—freedom of opinion—(cheers)—and no caucuses. (Laughter.) Every man should be able to form his own opinion, and do so with the best advice and assistance he could get, and having formed that opinion he should be free to act upon it. (Cheers.) Those were the principles which their forefathers acted upon, and which established this glorious empire. (Cheers.) Freedom was necessary not only against assaults of arbitrary power, but also against a far more dangerous and more subtle one—namely, of a mob or a democracy. Nothing could be more demoralising than to be subject to the arbitrary will of a multitude who were swayed in open ignorance by a few demagogues. (Cheers.) Whatever might be the opinions and whatever might be the mode of action of others, at least he was sure the principles he had endeavoured feebly to sketch out and recommend would continue to be the principles of the great Conservative party. (Great cheering.)

PRESENTATION OF THE FREEDOM OF THE CITY OF GLASGOW TO SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE.

Sir Stafford Northcote was, on Thursday, presented with the freedom of the city of Glasgow. The ceremony took place in the City Hall, which was densely crowded. The Lord Provost presided, and presented the burgess ticket, which was enclosed in a golden casket. Sir **Stafford Northcote** said he must thank them for the great and highly valued honour which they had bestowed upon him, and he could assure them that he was not insensible of its value. It was valuable because he was well aware that, as throughout the British Empire, so especially in Scotland, and perhaps more especially in Glasgow, there was that feeling which was at the foundation of all true patriotism—the love of their native country and their native place. (Cheers.) There it was that he saw the great distinction between the patriotism of British and the patriotism of many foreign subjects. Often it was the case they saw a spirit of patriotism in some great country like the United States of America, where the feeling was largely for the country but less for the particular place to which the speaker belonged. With the people of this country he thought it was very much otherwise. The patriotism which endeared our whole country to us sprang from the affection we bore to our own home and our own native place. It was because we loved our homes, and the associations of our homes, and that we expanded outwards towards the rest of the country, and to the rest of the world ; it was on that account he believed that England and Scotland and the British Empire had attained to the happiness and the greatness which they possessed. He knew that the feeling of love towards their own community, which had prevailed so strongly from the past times in Glasgow, had enabled them to develop their great city in a marvellous manner, and had enabled them under all changes, after all difficulties, and after all the different forms of enterprise that had been presented, to gain and maintain that high place amongst the cities of the Empire. (Cheers.) They heard sometimes that the greatness of the British Islands was on the wane, and that the time was coming when that greatness would pass over to other countries. We were also told of the rapid development of cities in the far West, which a few years ago were only a wilderness. These sentiments appalled us, but he held that the sentiment with which Glasgow regarded such rivalry was that of the Scotch colonel who, during the Abercromby Egyptian expedition, when the men were gazing excitedly at the Pyramids, said, "Keep steady, lads, and do not stare at these great mountains of stone as if you had never seen Ben Nevis." When he heard of the progress of mushroom cities and of the threatened prosperity of his own country named in future he should always remember he was a citizen of Glasgow. He had often wondered whether it would be more correct to say that the Clyde had made Glasgow or Glasgow made the Clyde ; but he thought there was a good deal of both. And then, as the Clyde had by its great natural advantages originally attracted those who had planted the city on its banks, so the energy of the citizens had improved the river, and developed its resources in a marvellous manner. The Clyde more than held its own in proportion to the other great ports in the important matter of ship-building, and he felt convinced that that same energy which had brought them to the present point would carry them on further, and that whenever he visited their city again he would be able to mark from time to time improvements and advances in the condition of those who were already in so far advanced a condition. (Cheers.) He was aware that on many important questions it had been his misfortune to differ from the opinions of the majority of the citizens of Glasgow ; but he was proud to think that, after so many years of public life, and after having been during the whole of that time more or less of a party man and obliged to engage in party matters, the condition in which we stood was such as to permit and make it possible for the honour they had done him that day to be conferred. It was a matter of gratification to him that a great community like theirs could, in the midst of party men and party battles, see and do justice to the motives and the conduct of their political opponents. (Cheers.) While that was the case—and long might it continue—he believed that the future of the United Kingdom was safe. They might have their difficulties, alarms, and battles, but he was sure there lived in the minds of Englishmen, Scotchmen, and Irishmen a sense of nationality and of public spirit which needed but to be called forth, needed but to be trusted in, to produce and to maintain the great race to which such destinies had been allotted. (Cheers.) A vote of thanks to the Lord Provost concluded the proceedings, and Sir Stafford was subsequently entertained at luncheon by the Corporation.

MR. LOWTHER AT HULL.

Mr. **James Lowther**, M.P., on Wednesday addressed a large meeting of Conservatives at Hull. He said, in the first place, it was satisfactory upon an occasion like that to be able to refer to a subject of national congratulation, which all of them could approach without distinction of political party. They could all, whether they were Whig or Tory, congratulate themselves and their common country upon the attainment of a great victory for the national arms. (Cheers.) He did not take any credit to the Opposition in the Houses of Parliament for the fact that no impediments were placed in the way of the Executive of the hour in combating the enemies of Her Majesty ; but unhappily they could not forget that not many years ago the enemies of the British nation were cheered in their opposition to British interests by the most eloquent voice which any British subject could command. They could not forget that British interests were openly scouted—that the true objects of national pride were denounced beforehand as unworthy of attainment. They could not shut their eyes to the fact that the Government, which at that time had the destinies of England confided to its hands, received more formidable opposition from some of Her Majesty's subjects than they did from those who were arrayed against them in the councils of other nations ; but happily the Conservative party had always been essentially the national party. (Cheers.) The great object of England, during the late Government was to maintain friendly relations with the Turkish Empire, and not only the Turkish Empire, but those great Eastern Powers who formed a solid basis for the maintenance of universal peace ; but when the present Government acceded to office different councils were called around Her Majesty the Queen. The object, then, was to estrange, as far as possible, the old allies who throughout the greater portion of this nation's history had stood by us in time of need. He had seen a great deal of criticism passed upon the Sultan of Turkey with regard to his attitude during the Egyptian crisis. He had seen it stated that the Sultan of Turkey ought to have taken a bold and determined stand in putting this Egyptian insurrection down. The Sultan of the Turks might not unfairly have argued to himself that force was no remedy—(laughter and cheers)—that before having recourse to brute force he might see how far remedial measures would attain the objects he aimed at. The order of the Medjidie conferred upon Arabi Pasha might, in the opinion of the Sultan, have constituted a remedial measure—(laughter)—but none of them could justify either the conduct of the Sultan throughout, or, what was more to the point for them, the conduct of those who had driven him into that state of unfriendly feeling towards this country which he felt sure the Ottoman Empire was most reluctant to assume. Members of Her Majesty's Government must not stand in the way of a solution of the Egyptian question which would be in accordance with the true instincts of the British people ; all sentimental ideas of Liberal politicians must be set aside in the settlement of this vexed question. He found an idea in some quarters that the opinions of the people of Egypt must be allowed to prevail with regard to the solution of the question which now awaited the consideration of Europe. Of course the happiness of human beings, wherever they might happen to reside, was a matter in which they would all take the liveliest and friendliest interest ; but to tell him that the future and security of our great highway to our Eastern Empire was to depend upon the caprice, the whims, and the prejudices of the people who happened to be living in the neighbourhood of the Suez Canal, was to propound a dogma of the utmost monstrosity. (Cheers.) As in Egypt, so in Ireland, the Government had realised the fact that force was a remedy, and some improvement was already apparent. Alluding to the proposed legislation with regard to procedure, the right hon. gentleman said that freedom of speech was an essential element in the British Constitution ; and the feeling of Conservative committees throughout the country was, that they did not intend to allow so dangerous an innovation in our institutions to be adopted by Parliament without the most strenuous exertions to avert so great a disaster to the liberties of the people of England.

THE IMPRISONMENT OF THE REV. S. F. GREEN.

Under the auspices of the Church of England Working-men's Society, a meeting to promote the release of the Rev. S. F. Green was held in the Assembly Room of the St. James's Hotel, Derby, on Wednesday evening. The large number of clergy present was very noticeable, and the "fairer sex" were also conspicuous by their presence. Mr. W. Inglis, of Leeds (President of the Church of England Working-men's Society), presided, and was supported by Canon Gregory, Canon Trevor, Sir T. Percival Heywood, Bart., the Hon. C. Lindley Wood (President of the English Church Union), Dr. Phillimore, the Rev. J. Charles Cox, Mr. J. Parker, M.A., the Rev. T. Pelham Dale, the Rev. Henry Meynell, Major-General Forbes M'Bean, Colonel J. B. Hardy, Captain Barnes, the Rev. Dr. West, the Rev. C.

Furadon Rogers, the Rev. W. Hope (St. Peter's, Derby), the Rev. W. S. Carter (St. Werburgh's), the Rev. E. B. Lavies (St. Luke's), the Rev. A. Preedy (St. Anne's), the Rev. J. C. Massey (South Normanton), the Rev. C. J. Fox (Little Eaton), the Rev. Dr. Wirgman, Mr. Chas. Bowring, J.P., the Rev. Dr. Belcher, Mr. Arthur Cox (Congress Secretary), the Rev. F. E. W. Wilmot (Chaddesden), Mr. Stafford C. Northcote, the Rev. J. Harry Buchanan, Col. Steward, the Rev. R. Lethbridge Farmer, Mr. Charles Powell (General Secretary), Mr. G. B. Holoran (President of the Derby Branch), Mr. F. W. Watson (Local Secretary), Mr. W. Lathbury, etc.

Canon Trevor having opened the meeting with prayer, the Lord's Prayer and Apostles' Creed were impressively recited by the vast assemblage, after which "The Church's One Foundation" was heartily sung.

The Chairman said that knowing the number of able and eloquent speakers who were to address the meeting on a subject dear to them all, it would be presumptuous on his part to occupy their valuable time with anything like a lengthy address. It was an honour to fill the post of Chairman at a meeting of this kind, but it was a greater honour to be identified in any way with the long-suffering prisoner in Lancaster Gaol. (Applause.) He was struck that morning on reading the report of the opening words of the sermon of the Archbishop of York. His Grace said, "If ever he had occasion to resort for guidance to the Holy Throne, this was such an occasion." To this they could all say, "Amen." His Grace went on to say, "The trials of the Church for the next few years seemed to be of a new type." With sorrow he (the speaker) believed they were. "They had no open persecution as when the sword of Diocletian worked potent as the lightning. No period had ever been more favourable, or given what was called fair play to the Church." Was that so? It might be so in the paradise where his Grace lived, but it was not so in this so-called free, fair land of England. With shame this had to be said. Was there not at the present moment a priest in gaol for conscience' sake? Was there not a black shadow—a black cloud—overshadowing the fair face and fair form of England? Was there not an organised body of men calling themselves Christians, who would trample over "justice prostrate," and despoil the Church of her beauty, and make her but a sect? It was to protest against this scandal, as Churchmen and Christians, as intense lovers of our National Church, and to save her from coming evils, that they were there that night. They were not mere declaimers and noisy agitators, eager to destroy; but their souls were filled with a burning desire to preserve and build up. And while speaking earnestly, they must have their words tempered with charity, for after all they looked upon the authors and prime movers of all this sad scandal more in sorrow than in anger. (Applause.)

Mr. C. Powell (General Secretary) read the following letter from the Rev. S. F. Green, whose name was loudly applauded :—

> Another Church Congress has come around, and you tell me that you are organising a meeting in Derby to protest against my continued detention in Lancaster Castle. I trust that although the efforts of my friends have failed to bring about my release, still, the last year and a half has witnessed some progress in winning, at least, a fairer hearing for those vital principles for which your Society contends, and which we hold to be essential to the very existence of the Church. From the first the only questions with me have been, "Is the Church of England worth defending? And if she be worth defending, how much is she worth?" The answer seems to me to be "Everything" or "Nothing!" She is worth every sacrifice or she is worth none at all. I can see no middle course whatever. If she be a part of the great Society founded by Jesus Christ; if she be the highest channel by which His gifts and graces flow to mankind; if the Church in her integrity be indeed the Kingdom of Heaven upon earth, then it is not only a religious obligation, but even the part of patriotism to defend for our country what we hold to be a treasure infinitely beyond any other which that country has inherited. This is, in plain words, the position that I occupy; it is that taken up by your Society, and must be in greater or less degree held by all who believe that the One Catholic and Apostolic Church in this land is the Church of England. Of that truth I have not, and never had, any manner of doubt. And though as we know our countrymen are largely apathetic and indifferent to the claims of the Church; although it be their habit to insist far more warmly upon what she is not than upon what she is; to protest against real or supposed abuses rather than to realise and be thankful for blessings received within her pale; still we may hope that better days are in store, if not in our time, at least in the not remote future, when the Church shall be once more not an object of suspicion and distrust, "but an eternal praise, the joy of all generations." Meantime, we must all, priests and people, be of good courage, and work, for we know that God is with us.

Letters of apology were also read from Canon Liddon, Lord Clinton, Lord Forbes, the Rev. Berdmore Compton, the Dean of Manchester, Canon Carter, Canon Lowe, the Rev. Dr. Gott (Vicar of Leeds), &c.

The Rev. Canon Trevor, who was applauded, proposed the first resolution, which was as follows :—

> That this meeting records its emphatic protest against the continued imprisonment of the Rev. S. F. Green, and regards it as an act of unnecessary cruelty to himself and family and a scandal to the cause of religion, and hereby respectfully urges upon the rulers of the Church the importance of at once demanding his immediate release.

He said that although he did not altogether agree with Mr. Green in his original action, his whole heart and soul were entirely absorbed in sympathy with him in the gross, illegal, and un-Christian tyranny to which he had been subjected. (Applause.) It would be idle to say merely that the imprisonment of a clergyman for his religious sentiments was un-Christian and tyrannical, and he was prepared to contend that it was not only against the law of the land, but that the imprisonment of Mr. Green was against the law, as the Legislature and the Bishops meant it to be; and was a law made by the lawyers against the principles of Church and State upon which they took their stand. (Applause.) He was not confined by the law, but by the gross perversion of the law effected by Lord Penzance. (Applause.) The chairman had said that the object of the proceedings on this matter was to reduce the Church of England to the level of a sect. He would, however, venture to take exception to that remark, and to say that neither Lord Penzance nor the Lord Chancellor would dare to imprison a member of any other sect, not even of the Salvation Army. (Applause.) Nobody but a priest of the Established Church, as they called him, would they venture to lay hands upon and send to prison. (Applause.) They were reduced to the condition of slaves; they had no voice in the Legislature, the clergy could not sit in Parliament; they had no representation, and therefore they were treated as their representatives dared not treat the ministers of any other denomination. (Applause.) He had mentioned the matter in conversation with members of Parliament, Bishops, Peers, and in various classes of society, but no one seemed to know exactly why Mr. Green was in prison. Every one of the Bishops said that they were not previously aware that the Public Worship Act could bring any power of imprisonment with it. Mr. Green belonged to the Convocation of York, and the Lower House of Convocation, who were the only persons in the kingdom entitled to represent Mr. Green, decided unanimously to request the Bishops to ask the Crown to release him. The Bishops, at the moment, did not agree to their petition, but they met very shortly afterwards, and agreed to very much more than the clergy asked. (Applause.) The two Archbishops accordingly brought a Bill into Parliament for the release of Mr. Green, and they did so at the suggestion of the Prime Minister, who was always an excellent friend of the Church when he happened to sit on the Opposition benches. Mr. Gladstone suggested that the two Archbishops should bring in the Bill; and they did so, but he was absent from the Legislature on the second reading, and the Attorney-General talked it out. (Laughter.) No lawyer could overcome the dreadful worship of his own handiwork. Lawyers had made the law in question; Mr. Green's offence was that of exposing the wickedness of their law, and if they could not break him down, they and their occupation were likely to undergo serious reproof from the people of England. (Applause.) Mr. Green had not offended against the law, but was observing it; and was, in fact, maintaining the law and the principles upon which the Church and the State were united. (Applause.) Mr. Green, again, was not imprisoned for ritualistic offences, but, according to Lord Penzance, for contumacy to the authority of the Archbishop of York; although his Grace repudiated this. (Applause.) The speaker then went on to contend that the imprisonment had occurred in consequence of a blunder between the Bishops and lawyers in the House of Lords, and asked whether the people of England would submit to it. ("No, no.") The clergy have done all they could, and it now remained for the laity to insist that justice should be done to this blameless and inoffensive man. (Applause.) Canon Trevor then spoke, amidst considerable emotion, of Mr. Green continuing in a dungeon which only ought to be inhabited by criminals and malefactors, and said he wondered how the Lord Chancellor, who was a highly honourable and religious man, could sleep quietly when he knew that a clergyman, by his own writ which was issued under a mistake, was incarcerated in Lancaster Castle. (Hear, hear.) He wondered how Mr. Gladstone could possibly be quiet while this great and gross breach of civil and religious liberty was being enacted. He did not wonder at the lawyers, but he was surprised that the laity did not rise up and demand Mr. Green's instant release. (Applause.)

Mr. Walter Phillimore, in seconding the motion, said, assuming for a moment that Mr. Green was a law-breaker, was he the only law-breaker in this matter? If Mr. Green was only one of the many law-breakers why was he punished, and so severely when every one else got off free? (Hear, hear.) First of all, who were the three prosecutors of Mr. Green? They declared solemnly (as the law required them) that they were members of the Church of England, but they complied with none of the conditions of membership. The canon law required that they should communicate at their parish church three times a year. Mr. Green and his curates did not know the face of any one of them. The duty of these prosecutors, moreover, according to the strict letter of the law, was to attend church every Sunday, but in that particular also they failed to comply with the legal requirements. The people really responsible for this prosecution were the Church Association. (Hisses.) Now that the Association was largely composed—or, at least, there was a large sprinkling in it—of clergy, without whose votes Mr. Green would never have been prosecuted. Did they ever put this question to themselves—"Do we keep the law or do we break it?" (Hear, hear.) Did they believe that any one of those clergy was not a law-breaker. ("No.") Did these clergy who consented to Mr. Green's prosecution hold daily services; did they observe Saints' Days; did they repeat the Athanasian Creed when it was ordered; did they refrain from wearing that black vestment, called a "stole," which they themselves had been instrumental in having declared illegal? (Laughter.) This prosecution could not have been instituted without the Bishop of Manchester. ("Shame.") Did they think *he* kept the law? ("No.") When his Lordship was challenged for not wearing the proper episcopal vestments, he did not resent the charge of lawlessness with indignation, but contented himself with complacently stating that it would be time enough for him to do so when his superior officer told him. In other words, he, a man himself in authority, would go on committing an act of lawlessness until his superior officer told him to stop. Lord Penzance was also concerned in this matter. Well, his Lordship had never signed the declaration required by canon law on the part of those sitting in the Arches Court, as he professed to do. It had been argued by the Attorney-General that Lord Penzance was not bound by the canons. If it came to this, what about the iniquity of the judgments which in the time past had punished so many clergy for disobedience to them? In the midst of this tissue of law-breakers, Mr. Green was the only one who had suffered. The second consideration was that the whole subject of contempt of Court—apart from the case of Mr. Green—needed careful attention and revision. Practically it came to this, that (unless there was dispensing power in the Crown) a person could be imprisoned for ever, unless he promised to do certain things. This was all very well in times when persons were imprisoned a lifetime for a debt of £20 or £40, and when the barbarous process of hanging, drawing, and quartering excited no particular disgust or attention. But it was out of harmony with the civilisation of the nineteenth century; and he was mistaken if the nation did not shortly demand that it should be swept away. (Applause.) What he thought they ought to do was to at once address the Lord Chancellor, who would reply whether or not there was a dispensing power in the Crown. If there was no dispensing power, then they would agitate unceasingly for the repeal of an untenable law. If there was a power, they would be able to put the blame on those who lacked the good will to exercise it. (Loud applause.)

The Rev. Dr. West (St. Mary Magdalene, Paddington) briefly supported the resolution, observing that his only object in rising was to express deep sympathy with Mr. Green, whose continued imprisonment (as his friend Mr. Berdmore Compton wrote) cast a shadow over this Congress gathering, and rendered it difficult for them to partake of its hospitalities, when they remembered that their dear brother was in prison. (Applause.)

Sir Percival Heywood (patron of the living of Miles Platting) was received with quite an ovation, the meeting rising to their feet and cheering vociferously. When the cheering had subsided, Sir Percival said: You do me a great honour and a great kindness. I accept it as your testimony to my dear and honoured friend. (Cheers.) I have in my pocket a paper in which there is a deliberate charge that I have acted in an underhand and intriguing manner. (Loud cries of "Shame!") There shall be no doubt from to-night. I have received from the Bishop of Manchester notice that the living of Miles Platting is voided. I do not accept the notice. (Loud and prolonged cheering.) Lord Penzance has no power to deprive a clergyman of the Church of England. (Hear, hear.) The English Church Union have fought Mr. Green's battle bravely and generously. My turn comes now. (Great cheering.) I am told—it is a villainous cruelty to tell me—that if I will put a new man into the living of Miles Platting Mr. Green shall be released. ("Shame.") What! Insult Mr. Green! Insult those churchwardens who have stood by him so loyally! Insult the parishioners, who one and all are praying that Mr. Green may be restored to them! No! So help me God. (Great cheering.) No word have I received till this notice reached me three days ago. I know now what action to take. I should fail in my duty to Mr. Green, to his parishioners, to Churchmen, and to my countrymen generally, if I did not take a firm stand in this matter. (Cheers.) I hold—and hold absolutely—that Mr. Green has been illegally imprisoned from beginning to end. I say there was no possible justification for it. I believe that, at last, such a feeling will be aroused among my fellow-countrymen that a demand will be made in unmistakable language that Mr. Green shall come out of gaol, and as rector of Miles Platting. (Great cheering.) That is the one object I have at heart. I pray God that I may succeed—I pray God that you may succeed. The very foundations of your Church will be shaken if you are beaten in this contest. If that man, whom the Archbishop of Canterbury has spoken of as a clergyman of unblemished character, is not only to suffer eighteen months' imprisonment, but, when he comes out, is to be turned with his family, a beggar, into the streets, I know not what my country is coming to. I say that this is a stain on my country, and I hope my countrymen will rise up as one man and demand that this great injustice shall be done away with, and that Mr. Green shall be restored to Miles Platting. (Great cheering, during which the hon. baronet resumed his seat.)

Sir Percival Heywood, again rising, said:—Before I sit down, I wish to say this much. One of my daughters has been lately staying amongst the people of Miles Platting. She tells me the one cry from the aged and sick of the parish is—"Let us only see our rector before we die." (Cheers.)

The Chairman: I am sure there will be only one feeling among you all—viz., to thank God for the words we have just heard—the most cheering we have listened to during Mr. Green's imprisonment. (Applause.)

The resolution was then put, and carried, with only one dissentient, amid considerable applause.

A collection was made at this stage of the proceedings on behalf of the Society, whilst the hymn, "Faith of our Fathers," was vigorously sung.

The Rev. Dr. Belcher, of London, proposed that a copy of the first resolution be forwarded to the Lord Chancellor, the Primates, and the Bishops. In the course of a sarcastic address he alluded to the bill of costs in the Miles Platting case, and, in referring to the fact that the Evangelical party occupied a portion of the premises in which the meeting was held, said that now the Working Men's Branch had obtained possession he would advise them to "hold the fort." (Laughter.) He then inquired whether they thought the Rev. H. C. Spurgeon, if committed for contempt of Court, would have remained in prison for eighteen months; whether any Roman Catholic would have been confined for a fortnight; or whether any member of the favoured sects, who so strongly supported the Government, would have been kept in prison so long. ("No, no.") Let no man believe for a moment the statement that the Government could not help Mr. Green; they could help him and bring him out of prison if they would. (Applause, and three cheers for the Rev. T. Pelham Dale.) He would urge the people to agitate continuously, and not to be debarred by what they might be told about embarrassing the Government. Let it be understood that whether a Conservative or Liberal Government was in power they would agitate for the right, and that it was their first duty to vote for Churchmen, even at the risk of disappointing their political friends. (Applause.) Mr. Gray, the High Sheriff of Dublin, was released from prison before his sentence had half expired; he was set at liberty because the Government were afraid to detain him any longer. Let the friends of Mr. Green therefore make it known that they will not submit to this kind of tyranny, and make the Government afraid to keep him incarcerated any longer. (Applause.)

The Rev. J. C. Cox, who was applauded, seconded the resolution. He congratulated the promoters of the meeting upon the large and enthusiastic assembly which had been gathered together in spite of the united difficulties which had been encountered. There was no more monstrous assertion than that the four clergymen who had been committed to gaol had alienated their parishioners from them, and this assertion could be entirely disproved by enquiry into the circumstances of each parish. (Applause.) He did not to his own knowledge know much about Miles Platting, but before hearing the definite statement just made by the patron of the living, he received a letter from a friend living in the neighbourhood of the parish, in which there was a statement of the marvellous manner in which Mr. Green had won the affections not only of persons who were actually Churchmen, but of Dissenters and others who were not in the habit of frequenting church, but who admired the purity of his life and his great self-denial. (Applause.) Let them not, in their enthusiasm and strong sympathy for Mr. Green, forget the other martyrs to their cause, who, although they were not now in gaol, might be subject to a like penalty. (Applause.) The far happiest Sunday he had spent recently was when he went, at the wish of his Vicar, to help Mr. Enraght. (Applause.) It was something wonderful to find in the poor district of Birmingham in which he was engaged, that the large church, which would accommodate 1,500 persons, was filled. This was not because of it being any special occasion, or because it happened to be a harvest festival, because there were eight adjacent churches in which harvest festivals were being held, and the whole of them had large congregations. (Applause.) At all events, he meant that Mr. Enraght's congregation was not of an unusual character. What greatly impressed him was, that during the three celebrations a very large number of the working classes thronged his altar in a most reverential demeanour, and he (Mr. Cox) could not help observing how universally beloved Mr. Enraght was by the people of his parish. (Applause.) It was no exaggeration to state that 24 out of every 25 adult persons in his parish proper, heartily and entirely agreed with him, as was shown by the poll when taken at the instance of his churchwarden. Let those present, therefore, not imagine for a moment that the promoters of the proceedings spoke the truth when they talked about the practices which the clergy indulged in alienating their parishioners; it was otherwise, for they had gathered the people round them in a most wonderful manner. (Applause.)

Mr. James Parker, M.A., of Oxford, briefly seconded the resolution.

The Hon. Charles L. Wood, President of the English Church Union, who was enthusiastically received, said that at that late hour of the evening he would only make this simple remark, that those who were acquainted with the difficulties which surrounded the Church of England on all sides knew that the accusation most freely made against her by Nonconformists and Romanists alike was that she was a mere department of the State. Mr. Green was in prison to maintain that the Church of England was not a department of the State, but that she was a portion of the Catholic Church. (Applause.)

The Rev. D. Hayman (late head master of Rugby School) and the Rev. Dr. Wirgman (Port Elizabeth, South Africa) also addressed the meeting in support of the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

The proceedings terminated with the Doxology.

Ecclesiastical.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Rev. B. Dale, Vicar of Bredhurst, to Vicarage of King's Lynn, Norfolk.

Rev. J. F. Dixon-Stewart, to Vicarage of Stanton St. Bernard, Wilts. Patron, the Right Hon. the Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery.

Rev. J. Durst, Vicar of King's Lynn, Norfolk, to Vicarage of Bredhurst, near Chatham.

Rev. E. V. Eyre, to Ministery of the district of the Holy Redeemer, Clerkenwell.

Rev. E. Godfray, to Rectory of Grantchester, Cambridge.

Rev. F. W. Haines, to Vicarage of Holy Trinity, Bromley-common, Kent. Patron, the Bishop of Worcester.

Rev. J. Holme, to Vicarage of Orton, Westmoreland. Patron, the Landowners of the Parish.

Rev. D. Lamplugh, Vicar of Horningsey, Cambridge, to Vicarage of Yalding, Kent. Patron, the Rev. F. Fitzpatrick.

Rev. A. Langdon, Rector of High Bickingdon, North Devon, to Vicarage of Sleaford, Lincolnshire.

Rev. A. Leakey, to Vicarage of Acton, Suffolk.

Rev. A. T. Lloyd, Vicar of Aylesbury, Bucks, to Vicarage of Newcastle-on-Tyne. Patron, the Bishop of Newcastle.

Rev. A. Gray Maitland, F.R.G.S., Curate-in-Charge of Holy Trinity, George-lane, Woodford, to Incumbency of St. Columba, Crieff, N.B. Patrons, six Trustees and six Vestrymen.

Rev. J. L. Payne, Curate of Lyonsdown, to Rectory of Milden, Ipswich.

Rev. H. C. Powell, to Rectory of Wylye, Wilts. Patron, the Right Hon. the Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery.

Rev. C. Warren, Vicar of New Clee, near Grimsby, to Vicarage of Saxilby, near Lincoln. Patron, the Bishop of Lincoln.

Rev. R. Yerburgh, Vicar of Sleaford, Lincolnshire, to Rectory of High Bickingdon, North Devon.

OBITUARY.

Sept. 24, suddenly, after long illness, at Oakfield, near Worcester, the Rev. George Augustus Bright-Smith, M.A., formerly Vicar of Hutton's Ambo, Yorkshire, eldest son of the late Bright Smith, Esq., of Hove, Sussex.

Sept. 29, at Monkstown, near Dublin, the Rev. Richard French Laurence, M.A., for 55 years Treasurer of Cashel, and late for nearly 54 years Rector of Borris and Leigh, county Tipperary, Ireland, aged 85.

Sept. 30, at Le Mars, U.S.A., Cecil Fawkes, youngest surviving son of the late Rev. Ayscough Fawkes, of Farnley Hall, Yorkshire, aged 36 years.

MISCELLANEOUS CHURCH INTELLIGENCE.

On Monday the Bishop of Ely instituted the Rev. J. L. Payne, curate of Lyonsdown, to the rectory of Milden, Bildeston, void by the resignation of the Rev. N. W. Hallward. The famous commentator, Dr. Burkitt, was once rector at this parish, and at his death bequeathed his very valuable library—containing between two and three thousand volumes—to all succeeding rectors. The church is of Norman architecture; the population is small, the adults numbering only thirty-four, while the annual value is £486 from tithe-rent charge.

The Bishop of Manchester, who preached at the reopening of St. Michael's, Hulme, last week, referred to the fact that it was one of seven or eight churches in Manchester which owed their existence to the liberality of the Birley family. His Lordship went on to speak of intemperance as a terrible vice, but said he could not agree with those who considered it to be our greatest evil, for he believed that licentiousness, such as was visible around them on every side in Manchester, was eating out the moral life of the nation.

The Rev. T. Holme, of Tebay, has been elected by the landowners of Orton, Westmoreland, to the vicarage vacant by the death of the Rev. J. S. Sisson. There were four candidates, and the voting was by ballot.

Canon Vernon, of Elton, Hull, chose a singularly apt text for Sunday, the 24th ult.—viz., Isaiah xix. 22, "The Lord shall smite Egypt; he shall smite and *heal* it.

The churchwardens of St. Simon's, Bristol, have received a letter from the Bishop acknowledging receipt of the memorial with reference to certain alleged illegal practices on the part of the newly-appointed vicar, the Rev. N. Y. Birkmyre. Bishop Ellicott states that he has also received a communication from the vicar, and that the matter shall receive his early consideration.

The restoration of Haggerston Church is being rapidly carried on by the Rev. G. Wingate, the newly-appointed vicar. The exterior has been renovated, and the graveyard converted into a recreation-ground; and it is now intended to beautify the interior at a cost of more than £500.

Another very beautiful Munich window has just been placed in the Church of St. Alphege, Blackfriars-road, the opening of which we had the pleasure of noticing a few months ago. It is in the Baptistry, and represents Our Saviour blessing children. Underneath there is a brass plate recording that the window has been erected in loving memory of Jane, wife of Major-General H. D. Taylor. The artists are Messrs. Mayer and Co.

Simultaneously with the reopening of St. James's, Clerkenwell, on the 13th instant, the Lord Mayor will unveil the two large painted windows, presented by the Crusaders Lodge of Freemasons in commemoration of the restoration of their parish church. The subjects of the windows are the Building of the Temple, and the Visit of the Queen of Sheba to Solomon upon its completion; the Freemasons' and Crusaders', together with numerous emblems and jewels pertaining to the Order, being skilfully introduced. The artist is Mr. Charles Evans, of Warwick-street, W.

A meeting of the Curates' Alliance was held on Friday last in the vestry of St. James's, Clerkenwell, the Rev. G. Hennessey presiding. Satisfaction was expressed at the success which had attended the protests of members on the occasion of advowsons being publicly offered for sale. With the exception of one advowson sold as part of an estate, the whole of such "property" recently brought under the hammer remained undisposed of. With reference to the forcible ejection of the chairman when he lately protested at the mart against an attempted sale of an advowson, it was stated by the secretary, the Rev. E. G. O'Donoughue, that several legal gentlemen had proposed to bring a case into Court at their own expense in order to test the right of the auctioneer to eject Mr. Hennessey, their contention being that the room was an "open and public place," and not, as the auctioneer put it, "his own private room."

The Mayor of Coventry (Mr. Tomson) has appointed the following as a committee to act with him in raising the proposed fund for extinguishing the vicar's rate in Trinity parish:—Alderman Gulson, Councillors Matterson, Sutton, and Singer, and Mr. W. S. Booth. The committee have already held a meeting, and it is said that subscriptions are coming in well. Among many other letters in reference to the Mayor's scheme, one has been received from the Bishop of Worcester, expressing his satisfaction and gratitude at the endeavour to settle the matter, adding—"I wish to be allowed to contribute £100 to the fund, and if eventually more is required it will give me pleasure to add a further sum."

On the eve of St. Michael and All Angels there was a service at Holy Trinity Church, Hawley, Hants, for the dedication of a new tower and spire, and of a peal of six bells; with this was combined a harvest thanksgiving service. The Bishop of Winchester officiated at the dedication service, and preached the sermon. At the conclusion of the service a peal was rung out by the ringers from Cranley, near Guildford. The tower and spire were erected at the cost of the family of the late Mr. C. Randell, of Fern Hill, Hawley. The building was under the direction of Mr. A. H. Hoole. The parishioners have contributed the price of the bells, which are from the foundry of Messrs. Warner, Cripplegate. The incumbent has added some mural decorations. A beautiful memorial window by Messrs. Clayton and Bell has been recently presented. The whole outlay on these improvements will exceed £2,000. The church, which was before rich in coloured glass, mosaics, carved stone, and embroidery, is now thought to be one of the most complete in the diocese of Winchester.

The York Diocesan Conference will meet on Wednesday and Thursday, 25th and 26th inst. There will be a celebration in the Minster on Wednesday at 10 a.m., and on Thursday at 8 a.m., and evening service at 5 p.m. each day. The offerings will be divided between the York Diocesan Church Extension and the York Diocesan Education Societies. The following are the *agenda*:—President's Address. The Wants of the Church in the Archdeaconry of York (Archdeacon Watkins); Ecclesiastical Courts (Canon Trevor); Purity: How is it to be cultivated among (*a*) men (*b*) women? (Rev. C. N. Gray, M.A., Archdeacon Blunt, Dr. Shann.) Men only will be admitted to this meeting. Proposed Changes in the Rules and Standing Orders; Special Resolution (National Society) (Sir W. C. Worsley, Bart.):—

> That this Conference approves the following resolution lately passed by the National Society, "That a petition be drawn up for presentation to the House of Parliament to the following effect:—That in School Board districts, subscribers to voluntary schools approved by the Education Department as efficient, may, to the amount of their subscriptions, be relieved from the rate levied for the support of Board Schools; or that other means be taken to redress the very unequal pecuniary conditions under which voluntary schools and Board Schools are respectively carried on in districts where school rates are levied."

Mr. Albert Grey's Church Boards Bill (the Hon. C. L. Wood, Sir Edmund Beckett); Attendance at Public Worship, and how to reach those who do not attend (Rev. G. C. Fisher, M.P.); How to use the Ministry of the Laity in the work of the Church, in view of the increase of the population and the need of more ministerial help (Bishop Cheetham, D.D., Dean Pusey Cust); Devotional Addresses (Canon Fleming and Canon Scott).

STAINED GLASS. — The Royal establishment of Mayer and Co., of Munich, whose London show-rooms are at 149, New Bond-street, submit, free of charge, designs for any windows in contemplation. Their works are executed in accordance with the style of architecture, in very best and richest pot-metal glass, or, if desired, with enamel and perspective drawings like in the windows of the Cathedrals of London, Glasgow, Cologne, and others.

The Sheppey Board of Guardians have had under consideration a proposal to amalgamate the parish of Warden, situate at the extreme end of the island, with Eastchurch. It was stated that the last vestry meeting at Warden was held at the residence of an old lady of ninety-three, who took the chair. There were only two other persons present, and the aged chair-"man" exercised the privilege of voting. Other "meetings" had consisted of a clergyman and one farmer, who assembled in a field, standing on either side of a gate. Some of the guardians expressed an opinion that as there was now no church at Warden, it having been pulled down in order to prevent it disappearing over the cliffs, and as divine service was no longer held in the parish, farmers and others ought not to continue paying tithes to the clergyman.

At Frampton Cotterell on Thursday the anniversary of St. Michael's Orphan Home and House of Rest for Suffering Children was celebrated by a series of special services. There were two celebrations at seven and eight o'clock. At eleven o'clock there was a full choral celebration, with sermon by the Rev. G. B. Roberts, vicar of Elmstone, Cheltenham. After the third celebration a meeting of parishioners and visitors was held in the rector's room, under the presidency of the Rev. C. H. V. Pixell, who regretted that, owing to illness that had broken out only on the previous Monday at the Home, the Sisters were prevented being present and entertaining them; and this, unfortunately, had to some extent damped the proceedings of the day. The Rev. R. A. Troyte, vicar of Winterbourne Down, proposed:—

> That this meeting desires to express its sense of the loss sustained by the Church through Dr. Pusey's death, and its thankfulness to Almighty God for the incalculable benefits which have accrued to the Church of England from his saintly life and Catholic teaching.

The Rev. T. H. Janson, vicar of Oldland, seconded the motion, which was unanimously carried. The Rev. W. C. Fox proposed:—

> That this meeting desires to express its sense of the grave scandal occasioned by the imprisonment of the Rev. S. F. Green for obedience to the law of this Church and realm, and to offer Mr. Green its hearty thanks for his steadfast maintenance of the rights and liberties of the Church.

Commander Fullerton, R.N., seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously. The Rev. G. B. Roberts, vicar of Elmstone, proposed:—

> That whereas the cure of souls is a spiritual charge canonically committed to each parish priest by his Bishop, in virtue of his Apostolic office, this meeting regards uncanonical deprivation by an irregularly-appointed layman, at the dictation of Parliament, as an intolerable infringement of the spiritual authority of the Church, and as *ipso facto* null and void.

This was seconded by the Rev. Henry Pixell, and carried without a dissentient. Evensong was held at three o'clock, when the preacher was the Rev. W. C. Fox. The Offertory during the day amounted to about £9 3s. Recently an additional cottage has been taken by the superintendent, which will be used for cases of sickness, but funds for providing necessary articles are needed.

A special service for the Salvation Army was held on the evening of Thursday week, at St. John's Church, Longsight, the invitation of the rector, the Rev. J. A. Atkinson, being largely responded to. A detachment marched from the Grosvenor-street Temple to St. John's headed by a brass band. Seats in the centre of the church had been reserved for them, and were all taken up. The rest of the building was open to the public and was densely crowded. The service began with the hymn, "Oh, for a heart to praise my God," the band leading the singing. The General Confession was afterwards recited by the rector, and was followed by the chanting of Psalm xcv. Between the two Lessons—which were appropriate to the occasion—the hymn, "Rock of Ages," was sung, and ofter the Second Lesson the hymn "Onward, Christian soldiers." The Apostles' Creed was then recited, and subsequently the Collects, the General Thanksgiving, and the Prayer of St. Chrysostom were gone through, followed by the singing of the hymn, "How sweet the Name of Jesus sounds," the band again leading. After Mr. Atkinson had delivered a short address, the service concluded with the Benediction. The *Manchester Examiner* says that the conduct of the members of the Army throughout was all that could be desired. They joined with great heartiness in the service, and the only point in which their demeanour was at all singular was in their giving utterance to some loud expressions of approval of passages in the prayers and in the address.

On the 16th Sunday after Trinity fell asleep in Jesus the "Father" of the diocese of Canterbury, in his 94th year—John Winter, M.A., rector of Postling, Hythe, Kent. Admitted seventy years ago to deacon's and priest's orders by Archbishop Vernon Harcourt, he faithfully served the Church as curate of Whitgift and Huddersfield, and subsequently as curate of Tynham and Doddington in Kent. From several candidates he was selected in 1821 to be chaplain of the Kent County Prison at Maidstone. The trying duties of that position he discharged for thirty years, when he was collated by Archbishop Sumner to the rectory of Postling, which his patron trusted would prove an "*otium cum utilitate.*" How far that hope has been realised can be easily inferred. He is said to have looked on his future sphere of labour with weeping eyes and a sad heart. The poor little village of Postling had known no resident pastor for well-nigh one hundred years. God's house was almost a barn, and the old rectory was represented by a labourer's cottage. Brighter days dawned, and the new rector set to work in good earnest to restore the sanctuary, provide a modest parsonage and means of education for the children of his parish. There he has worked for the last thirty-one years, beloved by his people and revered by his brother clergy. Though attached by early training to the old Evangelical school of thought, he was animated by a broad Catholic spirit, recognising and supporting by his means and influence both worth and work among "all sorts and conditions of men." Full of years and grace, the good old man has passed away to the "inheritance of the saints in light." On the Feast of St. Michael and All Angels the patriarch shepherd, his coffin covered with a cross and wreaths of white flowers, was laid to rest among his sorrowing flock, followed by a group of friends who loved him well—W. Deedes, Esq., of Sandling Park; Major Deedes, of Hillhurst, the Mayor of Hythe, and neighbouring clergy. So was a great grandfather "gathered unto his people" like a ripe shock that "cometh in in his season." "God's finger touched him and he slept."—*Guardian.*

The Vicar of Cold Ashby has been writing to the *Morning Post* about Great Paul, complaining that its inscription ought to have read "*Evangelistavero,*" and that its tone is inferior to that upon which the Cathedral clock strikes the hour. Sir E. Beckett disposes of the rev. gentleman, *more suo,* as one who propounds theories of campanology and Latin out of his inner consciousness; but Sir Edmund himself finds fault. He says:—

> Canon Cattley, of Worcester, and I went lately to inspect Great Paul and his "fixings," and we entirely agreed that the latter are in several respects wrong and will never answer as they are, though Paul himself is admirable, as we also thought at Loughborough, when we heard it rung and swung a good way up by twenty men with a heavier clapper. I said then that this mode of hanging would not do. It is even less fit for such a very large bell than it would have been for the Worcester one, which was hung quite differently by my advice in 1867, and can be rung in two different ways very easily by one man. I rang it and saw it rung in the harder of the two ways, swinging the bell itself a little (the other way swings the clapper only) by an old gentleman above eighty years of age and less than average size. The present mode of tolling Paul is equivalent, mathematically, to sliding more than eighteen tons about an inch along a flat surface at every pull, which is no trifle with the very best lubrication. Swinging it about a third up, the highest that is possible there, would be a great deal more. Swinging such a bell at all is nonsense, and practically it will never be done, and cannot even be tried without much additional provision for it. Even tolling it as it is involves a great waste of labour and expense, and condemns it to too low a place in the tower, which is another of its present difficulties. As they would have such a huge bell, whether wisely or not, it will never give satisfaction until it is put in the place of the present old bad clock bell, which musicians used to say sounds five notes instead of one.

Dr. Stainer rejects the Vicar of Cold Ashby's theory that the bell is too heavy. He says:—"I am fully aware that the British public prefers the noise, for I find it almost a hopeless task to persuade people that very big bells cannot produce, and ought not to produce, a noisy sound; a soft, rich, full tone constitutes their merit. The only question is, Where does the softness commence? From my own experience, I should say that bells become rapidly softer as they become heavier than 4 or 5 tons, or lighter than 4 or 5cwt.; or, roughly speaking, when they exceed the compass of the two octaves lying between A flat below the treble stave and the A flat one leger-line above it. The upward limit of loud bells seems to be well known, but the downward limit seems inconceivable to many persons; they fancy that when a bell as heavy as 16 tons is struck they ought to be knocked down flat on their backs. Such listeners have no stomach for a beautiful quality of tone—they expect to be stunned by a hideous din, and finding they are not stunned they pronounce Great Paul a failure. The number of large bells which have been cracked in efforts to 'bring out their tone' is extraordinary. Thousands of pounds have thus been wasted in an attempt to overthrow a natural law. The experiments have indeed brought out the tone of Big Ben by converting it into a dismal gong, which vitiates the taste of our public hour by hour. Of course its jingle is heard far and wide, for no better position for a bell exists in the world. Big Ben is practically suspended in the handle of a huge walking stick stuck in the bank of the river. The situation of Great Paul is not so fortunate, although it received the hearty sanction of its founder. The bell, however, cannot be placed higher without disturbing the old hour-bell, and so bringing forward many delicate questions. But I mean to resist to the utmost the efforts of those kind advisers who are ready to suggest scores of methods by which the supposed tone of Great Paul could be 'brought out.' If Great Paul should ever be improved into a Big Ben it would be a national calamity. I must say I trust I may live to see it hung in the more commanding position now held by the hour-bell, but in the meantime I hope its daily use will teach the public to appreciate its beautiful, rich, musical sound."

The following is the letter referred to by Sir Percival Heywood, patron of the living of St. John's, Miles Platting, which he received in the early part of the week from the Bishop of Manchester:—

Manchester, Sept. 27, 1882.

Re the Benefice of St. John's, Miles Platting.

Sir,—My attention has been called to the 58th section of 1 and 2 Vic., cap. 106, which, coupled with the 13th section of the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, requires that I shall give notice to the patron upon a benefice becoming void under that Act. As you are aware, I was in no way a party either to the inhibition or imprisonment of Mr. Green, nor did I in the first instance transmit the representation to the Archbishop of the province (as after considering the whole circumstances of the case, I considered I was bound by the Act to do), until after Mr. Green and the parties making the representation had each declined to submit to my directions. No official information or evidence has as yet been furnished to me as to any proceedings which may have been taken in or in reference to the suit, subsequent to the decree of inhibition by Mr. Green pronounced the 9th of August, 1881, which evidence and information I am advised I am entitled to receive before giving notice that the benefice has become void. More than three years, however, have elapsed since the date of the monition, and it is a matter of common notoriety that Mr. Green still remains in prison, and that the inhibition has not been relaxed. It has been suggested to me that an omission on my part to give the notice required by the Act, may possibly be the means of prolonging Mr. Green's imprisonment, and that the giving of such notification may possibly facilitate his liberation, and as I am most anxious that no act or omission of mine should in any way contribute to the imprisonment of Mr. Green, or hinder his liberation; and being also advised that in the circumstances of the case, assuming these circumstances to be in fact as reported and as I believe them to be, the benefice of St. John the Evangelist, Miles Platting, has now become void. I do, by this writing under my hand, and in pursuance of the provisions of the said Act, give notice to you, as patron thereof, that the benefice of St. John the Evangelist, Miles Platting, has become void. I must request you to be kind enough to acknowledge the receipt of this notice to my Secretary, Mr. John Burder, 7, St. James-square, Manchester.—I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

J. MANCHESTER.

Sir Percival Heywood has simply forwarded a formal acknowledgment of the Bishop's letter.

THE COURT.

The Queen remains at Balmoral.

The Marquis of Hartington arrived at Balmoral on Saturday as Minister in attendance on Her Majesty.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. Alderman Knight has been elected Lord Mayor of the City of London for the ensuing year.

Mr. Michael Roberts, Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, died on Wednesday. The deceased, who had attained his 66th year, was a distinguished mathematician. Dr. Stubbs succeeds to the vacant Senior Fellowship.

A fatal accident occurred on Friday morning at Portadown. A blacksmith named Fox was walking home about three o'clock, and on coming to the railway bridge, instead of going to the roadway by the tunnel, he climbed upon the railings, over which he fell a depth of 25ft., and was killed.

At Oxford, on Friday, Joseph Tebbett pleaded guilty to robbing the alms-boxes of Keble College and St. Aloysius' Church, and was sentenced to three months' imprisonment for each offence.

A farmer named Samuel Phippen, living at Beckington, near Frome, shot two labourers dead and wounded a boy on Friday, and was afterwards apprehended with a loaded gun in his possession, having evidently been drinking.

A young labourer named Crow, on Saturday night, while drunk, stabbed his cousin, George Green, in the breast with a clasp-knife, in Drury-lane, causing his instant death, and has since been committed for trial for wilful murder.

The death of one of the explorers in the recent most interesting expedition from China into Burmah, is announced. Mr. Charles Wahab, the companion of Mr. Colquhoun in this expedition, has succumbed to the trials and fatigues of the journey. As soon as the expedition arrived at Bhamo Mr. Wahab was taken ill from over-exertion and privation on the march, and he appears never to have rallied, although carefully nursed in the Rangoon and Calcutta hospitals. A telegram has just reached his family from Suez reporting his death in the Red Sea, on board the *City of Venice*, on the voyage home. Mr. Colquhoun also suffered greatly from the fatigues of the journey, but has recovered, and is now on his way home from Bombay.

The inaugural address of the President of the Baptist Union (the Rev. J. Jenkyn Brown) was delivered at Myrtle-street Chapel, Liverpool on Wednesday morning. He said that the pressing question of the day was the purity, activity, and usefulness of all the Churches. The report of the Home Mission Fund, which showed a deficiency on the year's expenditure of over £670, was adopted, and a wish expressed that rural churches should be maintained if the Baptists were to extend their power and influence. It was resolved to take steps to raise an additional £1,000 in aid of the Home Mission Funds, and £750 were subscribed on the spot. In the afternoon Mr. Spurgeon held a religious service and addressed about 5,000 persons in Hengler's Circus.

The passenger steamboat *Robert E. Lee,* which gained the name of "champion of the Mississippi" by her many victories in races upon that river, was burned on the Mississippi, about thirty miles below Vicksburg, on Friday night. When the fire was discovered the steamboat was under way, and the flames spread so rapidly that every person on board was in imminent peril. It is known that twenty-one deaths have resulted, including several women. Most of the survivors were more or less burned. Every life depended on the fidelity and courage of the engineer and pilot, who, in spite of being scorched by the flames, maintained their posts until the steamer was run ashore, when they escaped, though much burned. The amount of loss is uncertain, but it includes many thousand bales of cotton.

The funeral of her Royal Highness the Duchess of Parma, who died at Biarritz on the 30th ult., and of the newly-born child, who survived the mother only a few minutes, took place there on Monday last. The procession started from the ducal residence on the Atalaye at ten a.m., and was of great length, being followed by an immense concourse of people of all ranks, desirous of marking their sympathy for a family long respected in the neighbourhood. The remains of the infant prince were placed in a hearse entirely draped in white satin, drawn by six white horses, and surrounded by little boys and girls, also all dressed in white and bearing white garlands. The body of the Duchess was borne in a hearse covered with black cloth and draped with sable plumes. The ducal family, including his Royal Highness the Count de Bari, followed the hearses on foot, the Duke himself on the right; then came her Britannic Majesty's Vice-Consul, Captain Bellairs, specially representing the Princess Frederica of Hanover, who is at present in Switzerland, but who usually resides for a portion of the year in Biarritz, and was a great friend of the late Duchess. Next followed all the leading notabilities of the district, and a great many persons of high rank from Spain and other countries now staying at Biarritz. The clergy of the diocese of Bayonne, headed by their Bishop, led the procession, a band playing the Dead March alternately with the chanting of a numerous body of choristers from the Cathedral and the Sisters of Mercy from the refuge of Auglet, who all carried wax tapers. A choral service was solemnised at the parish church, and the bodies were deposited in a vault in the old churchyard. It was understood that many other representatives of Royal Families would have been present had it not been for the impossibility of communicating by telegraph in consequence of the damage caused by the late floods in Italy and Austria. The Duchess, who was Princess Marie Pie des Graces, daughter of Ferdinand VII., King of Naples, was only 33 years of age, and had been the mother of twelve children, three of whom have died.

Painted windows as memorials of departed worth and gallantry have an interest in the eyes of all. Mr. W. G. Taylor has at all times pleasure in showing his works in progress, both for church and hall, the introduction of likenesses in windows being a special study. Designs and estimates sent. Medal awarded to works in Paris Exhibition. The "Art" Works, 4, Berners-street, London, W.

2/- TEA OF EXTRAORDINARY QUALITY,

As Supplied to Dukes, Earls, Barons, and the County Families of England.

THE unprecedented depression in the Tea Market now enables COOPER COOPER and CO. to offer such value in Tea as would, a few years ago, have been considered simply impossible, but is now a realised fact, for at

TWO SHILLINGS A POUND

COOPER COOPER and CO. are able to supply Tea of amazing strength and exquisite quality, while the choice kinds at Three Shilling a pound, which are coming to hand in lessening quantities year by year, COOPER COOPER and CO. have the greatest difficulty, after ransacking the markets of China and India, in procuring in sufficient quantities for their consumption. These choice and selected Teas COOPER COOPER and CO. have the honour to supply to many Foreign Princes, Potentates, Ambassadors, &c.

THE enormous success—without competitors and with no rivals—which has attended the sale of COOPER COOPER and CO.'S Teas is perhaps unparalleled in the annals of this or any other trade, and can only be accounted for by the way in which their business has been conducted, which has gained the patronage of all classes. COOPER COOPER and CO. number among their customers Princes, Dukes, Earls, Barons—in fact, a large per-centage of the entire Peerage—Church dignitaries of every grade, and ministers of all denominations, County families from every county in Great Britain, and from all classes of the community. COOPER COOPER and CO. are also shipping their Teas every day to foreign parts. Paris would appear to draw its supplies from COOPER COOPER and CO.'S Stores, and in almost every large city, and especially in the seaport towns of Europe, Asia, Africa, and America—in fact, to the very ends of the earth—COOPER COOPER and CO.'S Teas and COOPER COOPER and CO.'S name are known.

COOPER COOPER and CO. have their own Agents in China and India, and are consequently able to sell their Tea at a price which is actually under that which wholesale merchants, brokers, &c., charge to ordinary dealers. They are enabled to do this, as they have not the expense of travellers and no bad debts to provide for, their terms being strictly for nett cash before delivery. They also save an immense amount by keeping no horses and vans—many houses having from 20 to 100 horses, vans, and two men to each, to deliver, sometimes, half-a-pound of tea miles and miles away, this overwhelming expense having all to come out of the quality of the Tea.

COOPER COOPER and CO. have, in fact, no expense but indispensable rent and labour, which, in consequence of still-increasing business, amount only to a fraction on the price of the Tea they sell.

COOPER COOPER and CO. may mention that they include among the regular buyers of their Tea a great many London Tea Brokers, from the simple fact that it can be purchased cheaper and better from them than from the importers themselves.

COOPER COOPER and CO. sell their Teas for ready money only. They have thus no provision to make for bad or doubtful debts.

AND now a word about this year's crop. It is hardly satisfactory on the whole, but some of the choice crops secured by COOPER COOPER and CO are simply delicious. COOPER COOPER and CO. are still enabled to sell the very best at Three Shillings a pound, and it is veritably a marvel of goodness—a "thing of beauty" and "a joy for ever." But the most astonishing thing of modern times is the Tea at Two Shillings a pound which COOPER COOPER and CO are now selling. The rich and wealthy buy this Tea. Ladies drink it in their boudoirs, and at their early drums, and as one of our country patrons writes, "It is lovely."

COOPER COOPER and CO. may add that

INDIAN TEA

is becoming day by day a greater favourite among the best judges, and this year's crop has been prepared with greater care than ever. It is strong, pungent, with most agreeable flavour, and the better it is known the more it will be liked.

THE TEA IS 3s. A POUND FOR THE BEST.

COOPER COOPER and CO. charge threepence a package (of any size) for delivering their Teas at any of the Railway Stations in London, or any place within the limits of the London Parcels Delivery Co., thus putting all on an equality: those who send for their Tea, and those who require it sent.

COOPER COOPER and CO. do not pay railway carriage, but are willing to compound for the same on receiving the sum of 6d., in addition to the price of the Tea, to any Railway Station in England, on quantities of the value of £2 and upwards. Families residing in the country can thus by clubbing together, have their Tea sent almost carriage free, as well as save about 9d. a pound in the cost.

COOPER COOPER & CO.,

50, King William Street, London Bridge; 63, Bishopsgate Street Within, E.C.; 268, Regent Circus, W.
35, Strand (near Charing Cross), W.C.; 7, Westbourne Grove, London, W.

BIRTHS.

Sept. 6, at Shimoga, Mysore, the wife of Lieut-Colonel TREDWAY CLARKE, Madras Staff Corps, of a daughter.

Sept. 26, at Ditton, Cambridge, the wife of WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, Fellow of Gonville and Caius Coll., Camb., of a daughter.

Sept. 26, at Hounslow, the wife of Lieut.-Colonel PHILIPS, 4th Hussars, of a daughter.

Sept. 28, at Pynes, Exeter, the wife of the Rev. J. S. NORTHCOTE, of a daughter.

Oct. 2, at 13, Montagu-place, Bryanston-square, the Countess WALDEGRAVE, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

Aug. 24, at St. Vincent's, Isandhlwana, South Africa, by the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Zululand (brother of the bride), the Rev. GEORGE HERVEY SWINNY, M.A., Priest in Charge of Kwa Magwaza, Zululand, youngest son of the late Rev. H. Hutchinson Swinny, M.A. (Principal of Cuddesdon Theological College), to EDITH MARIA, youngest daughter of J. D. MCKENZIE, Esq., of St Albans, Herts.

Sept. 30, at the Greek Church, Moscow-road, Bayswater, PETER CALLIGAS, second son of Paul Calligas, of Athens, to JULIA, youngest daughter of the late PANDIA A. RALLI, of 96, Westbourne-terrace, London.

Sept. 30, at Wrotham Parish Church, Kent, Major COX, 13th Lt. Infantry, son of the late William Cox, Ballynoe, county Limerick, to MARY EMMA, second daughter of the late Rear-Admiral Sir ARMAR LOWRY CORRY, K.C.B.

Sept. 30, at St. George's, Hanover-square, the Rev. HENRY H. N. HOWARD, Vicar of Weekley, Northamptonshire, to ISABELLA, third daughter of the late JOHN SINCLAIR, Esq., of Warwick-square, London.

Oct. 3, at St. Bartholomew's Church, Sydenham, FREDERICK COTMORE COOPER, of The Warren, Norfolk, eldest son of F. Cooper, Esq., of Edinburgh, and Cricklewood, London, to LOUISE, third daughter of the Rev. D. J. DRAKEFORD, M.A., of Elm Grove, Sydenham, and Brookside, Sussex.

DEATHS.

Sept. 23, Rear-Admiral SAMUEL HOOD HENDERSON, aged 50.

Sept. 27, of rapid consumption, FRANCIS E. VERNON ROYLE, B.A., Oriel, Oxon, only son of J. Vernon Royle, Curzon Park, Chester, aged 24 years.

Sept. 29, at Springhill, near Coldstream, the Hon. Mrs. MARY SIDNEY DOUGLAS, widow of the late Robert Douglas, Esq., of Strathendry, youngest daughter of the late Right Hon. Archibald, Lord Douglas of Douglas, in the 87th year of her age.

Sept. 29, at Mearhay, Beaminster, Dorset, EMILY MYRA STEELE, eldest daughter of the late Sir Robert Steele, Knt., aged 59.

Sept. 30, at Sutherland House, Sutton, Surrey, WM. CUTHBERT HOPPER-CUTHBERT, only son of the late Rev. John Robt. Hopper, M.A., Rector of Wells, Norfolk, aged 47.

Oct. 1, at Leath House, Sandgate, EVELYN MARY, child of the Rev. JOHN W. BOYD, aged 3 years and 5 months.

Oct. 1, at 33, Cadogan-place, Lady RODNEY, widow of the late Lord Rodney.

LONDON THEATRES, &c.

COVENT GARDEN PROMENADE CONCERTS, EVERY EVENING.—Orchestra, 100 performers. Band of the Coldstream Guards. Mr. Carrodus, leader; Mr. Howard Reynolds, solo cornet. Conductor Mr. A. GWYLLYM CROWE.

THEATRE ROYAL DRURY LANE.—This Evening, at 8, PLUCK: a Story of £50,000. At 7.15, FOGGED.

ADELPHI. — This Evening, at 7.45, DRINK. At 7.15, FAMILIES SUPPLIED.

LYCEUM THEATRE.—MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING, will be presented on Wednesday next, at a quarter to 8.

THEATRE ROYAL HAYMARKET.—This Evening at 8.10, THE OVERLAND ROUTE.

ROYAL PRINCESS'S THEATRE.—This Evening at 8, THE ROMANY RYE. At 7.50, A PHOTOGRAPHIC FRIGHT.

GAIETY THEATRE, STRAND.—This Evening, at 7.40, MY ONLY COAT. At 8.15 LITTLE ROBIN HOOD.

OLYMPIC THEATRE.—This Evening, at 8, FUN ON THE BRISTOL.

GLOBE THEATRE.—This Evening, at 8, CRAZED. At 8.30, THE VICAR OF BRAY.

VAUDEVILLE THEATRE, Strand.—This Evening at 8, MONEY.

ROYAL COMEDY THEATRE.—This Evening at 8, BOCCACCIO. At 7.15, THE FAST COACH.

ALHAMBRA THEATRE.—In consequence of arrangements having been made some time ago to produce a new opera by Johann Strauss, before Christmas next, the management is reluctantly compelled to withdraw the enormously successful fairy extravaganza BABIL AND BIJOU, now in the height of its popularity; therefore, BABIL AND BIJOU can only be played in its entirety until Saturday, 14th October; and on Monday, 16th October, the new comic opera, THE MERRY WAR, which has caused a perfect furore in Austria and Germany, will be produced.

CRITERION THEATRE.—This Evening, at 8.45, LITTLE MISS MUFFET. Preceded by, at 8, CUPID IN CAMP.

TOOLE'S THEATRE.—This Evening, at 7.30, WAITING CONSENT. At 8, THE UPPER CRUST. Conclude with Mr. GUFFIN'S ELOPEMENT.

SAVOY THEATRE.—This Evening, at 8.30, the new æsthetic opera, PATIENCE. Preceded by, at 8, MOCK TURTLES.

AVENUE THEATRE.—This Evening, at 8.15, MANTEAUX NOIRS. At 7.30, SIMPSON AND DELILAH.

SURREY THEATRE—This Evening, at 7.30, FOR EVER.

NATIONAL STANDARD THEATRE, Bishopsgate.—This Evening, at 7.15, HOPE. Conclude with THE SECRET.

CRYSTAL PALACE.—Week ending October 14.
Tuesday—First Day of Cat Show. Comedy, STILL WATERS RUN DEEP, under the direction of Mr. Alfred Nelson. Wednesday—Last Day of Cat Show. Thursday—Great Firework Display by Messrs. C. T. Brock and Co. Comedy, LOVE CHASE, under the direction of Mr. Alfred Nelson. Marian, the Alhambra Giantess, &c., &c. Saturday—First Saturday Concert, Mr. Edward Lloyd, Mr. Oscar Beringen, &c., &c. Organ Recital. Tricycle Championship. Billiard Match, W. Cook v. J. Bennett.

DAILY.—Orchestral Band (Conductor, Mr. August Manns). Organ (Mr. A. J. Eyre), &c. Dr. Lynn's Marvellous Entertainment, Jennian's Marionette wonders. Panorama, painted by M. Philippoteaux (admission one shilling). Electric Railway. Skating Rink, &c., &c.

Admission to Palace, Monday to Friday, One Shilling; Saturday, Half-a-crown; or by Season Ticket.

ROYAL AQUARIUM.—The Palace of Amusement.—Stupendous and Unrivalled Attractions. Grand Variety Entertainment on a scale of Unsurpassed Magnificence. The Aviaries, Tanks (newly stocked), Insectorium, &c., are now on view daily. Admission to One and All Entertainments, One Shilling. No extra charges.

PHŒNIX FIRE OFFICE, Lombard-street and Charing cross, London. — Established 1782.

Insurances against Loss by Fire and Lightning effected in all parts of the World.

Loss claims arranged with promptitude and liberality.

JOHN J. BROOMFIELD, Secretary.

LOANS, large or small, for long or short periods, repayable by instalments or otherwise. Assurance optional. No charge whatever till money is advanced, except when long distances have to be travelled.—NATIONAL GUARDIAN ASSURANCE COMPANY (Limited), 21 (late 484), New Oxford-street, W.C. T. J. BOURNE, Secretary.

Fountains of many Designs.

SANDERS & CO.,

365, EUSTON ROAD

HAVING bought most of the MODELS of the late firm of AUSTIN & SEELEY, are prepared to execute work in every kind of

GARDEN ORNAMENT.

Also a Large Stock of

MONUMENTAL WORK

In Granite, Marble, and Stone kept on hand.

ALLEN'S PORTMANTEAUS.
ALLEN'S DRESSING BAGS.
ALLEN'S GLADSTONE BAGS.
ALLEN'S OVERLAND TRUNKS.
ALLEN'S BARRACK FURNITURE.
For Officers Joining. Cash discount, 10 per cent.
37, WEST STRAND, LONDON.
New Illustrated Catalogues Free.

HEDGES & BUTLER'S Dinner Sherries at 20s., 24s., and 30s. per dozen. Choice Sherry, 36s., 42s., and 48s.

London: 155, Regent-street, W., and 30, King's road, Brighton

HEDGES & BUTLER'S Pure Clarets at 18s., 20s., and 24s. Choice Clarets, 42s., 48s., 60s., and 72s. per dozen.

HEDGES & BUTLER'S Sparkling Champagnes at 36s. and 48s. per dozen.

Choice Champagnes, 60s., 72s., and 78s. per dozen.

HEDGES & BUTLER'S Choice Old Ports at 42s., 48s., 60s., 72s., and 84s. per dozen.

Port from the Wood, 24s., 30s., and 36s. per dozen.

HEDGES & BUTLER, 155, Regent Street, London, and 30, King's-road, Brighton, Importers and Bottlers of the pure Wines of France, Germany, Spain, and Portugal, from the lowest price commensurate with soundness to the most récherché descriptions and esteemed vintages. Originally established A.D. 1667.

BRAND and CO.'S OWN SAUCE.

SOUPS, PRESERVED PROVISIONS.

POTTED MEATS and YORK and GAME PIES; also

ESSENCE of BEEF, BEEF TEA,

TURTLE SOUP, and JELLY, and other

SPECIALITIES for INVALIDS.

CAUTION: BEWARE OF IMITATIONS.

SOLE ADDRESS:

11, LITTLE STANHOPE STREET, MAYFAIR, W.

FRY'S COCOA

Gold Medal, Paris, 1878. First Award and Medal Sydney, 1880. Melbourne, 1881.

FRY'S CARACAS COCOA

"A most delicious and valuable article.—*Standard.*

PURE COCOA ONLY.

FRY'S COCOA EXTRACT

"Strictly pure."—W. W. STODDART, F.I.C., F.C.S., City Analyst, Bristol.

FIFTEEN PRIZE MEDALS.

1s. 1½d., 2s. 3d., and 4s. 6d. **RÉNÉ'S** 1s. 1½d., 2s. 3d., and 4s. 6d.

CURE FOR RHEUMATISM,

Gout, Lumbago, Neuralgia, Sciatica, Tic Douloureux, Toothache; Colds on, or Tightness of, the Chest, Bronchitis, Difficulty of Breathing; Sprains, Strains, and Bruises; Swollen Glands, Mumps, Swollen, Inflamed, or Tender Feet, Stiffness of Joints, Cramps, Corns and Chilblains.

Réné's Cure for Rheumatism is made from the prescription of an eminent French Physician, and has now been before the public for upwards of twenty years. It is not a quack remedy, and never fails to afford relief. It softens the ligaments and strengthens the joints, and removes all pains as if by magic.

SPECIMEN OF MANY TESTIMONIALS RECEIVED.

10, Storey's Gate, St. James's Park, London.

Gentlemen,—Having for many years known several of the component parts of "Rene's Cure for Rheumatism," which I always recommend to sufferers as being one of the few genuine patent medicines of the day, it affords me much pleasure to send you an expression of the repeated good opinions I have received of its efficacy. Most of those customers to whom I have supplied it have recommended others to use it. If this is of any use you may publish it.—Yours truly,

H. E. LONGMORE, Registered Chemist by Examination.

To Messrs. W. Freeman and Co.

Kept in Stock by all the Wholesale Patent Medicine Dealers in London.

Should any difficulty arise in obtaining it, single bottles will be sent, carriage paid, without extra charge, to any address in London or Suburbs, on receipt of remittance; or to any County Address, securely packed, if remittance be sent to the

Depôt Address:

W. FREEMAN and CO.,
142, Gower Street, London, W.C.

OLDRIDGE'S

BALM OF COLUMBIA.

ESTABLISHED SIXTY YEARS.

Warranted not to injure Health or Skin. It prevents Baldness and the Hair Turning Grey; Cleanses from Dandriff, Restores when falling off; Strengthens Weak Hair; Causes Eyebrows, Whiskers, and Moustaches to grow; and when used for Children forms the basis of a Magnificent Head of Hair.

Sold by all Chemists and Perfumers, 3s. 6d. 6s., and 11s.
22, Wellington-street, Strand, London, W.C.

HOLLOWAY'S OINTMENT & PILLS.—For bad legs, gathered breasts, and scrofulous sores these are genuine specifics. The grateful and earnest gratitude of thousands who have experienced their unrivalled power over these complaints, and who have been raised from prostrate helplessness and a condition loathsome to themselves and others, renders it quite unnecessary to enlarge in this place upon their extraordinary virtues. The parts affected should be bathed with lukewarm water, and when the pores are thereby opened the Ointment should be well rubbed in, at least twice a day. It is always advisable to take Holloway's Pills in these disorders, as they greatly assist the Ointment's action. The Pills check the fever and inflammation, purify the blood, and eject all morbid matter from the system.

PULVERMACHER'S PATENT

GALVANIC CHAIN BANDS, BELTS, & BATTERIES.

THE "LANCET," Vol. 2, xvii., contained, from the pen of Dr. GOLDING BIRD, A.M., F.R.S., F.L.S., an article on Pulvermacher's Galvanic Chains, of which the following is an extract:—"The ingenious Galvanic "Chain of Dr. Pulvermacher has attracted "so much attention that an account of its "value may prove interesting. Shocks are "not required to develope physiological "phenomena or therapeutical effects, as the "laborious researches of Dr. Marshall Hall "have long since proved; and it is only to "the mild continuous voltaic currents that "we can look for a vast development of "therapeutical influence."

THE "MATERIA MEDICA," 4th Ed., page 53, by Dr. I. PEREIRA, F.R.S., F.L.S., contains the following extract:—"The "application of the voltaic circuit has "been largely prescribed, and has become "a popular remedy in the form of Pulvermacher's Galvanic Chains. They should "be worn so as to encircle the part affected, "in cases of Rheumatism, Paralysis, &c. "They are regarded by practitioners as a "valuable and convenient means of applying "the continuous voltaic current."

PULVERMACHER'S CHAIN BANDS, BELTS, and BATTERIES are the only real electro-generators extant, at once portable, simple, and highly efficacious in many ailments. Their extensive restorative power is due to the mild and easily regulated electric currents they so readily evolve.

MR. PULVERMACHER, after long years of perfecting work, is now enabled to give such inducements that no one need hesitate a moment to try these wonderful electro-curatives, with which no other electro-generator extant can be compared in effectiveness, portability, cheapness, and simplicity of self-application.

"GALVANISM, NATURE'S CHIEF RESTORER of IMPAIRED VITAL ENERGY," is the title of a pamphlet which will repay perusal, and give every sufferer that confidence in PULVERMACHER'S GALVANIC ELECTRIC APPLIANCES which they deserve.

THIS PAMPHLET will be sent, post-free, from

J. L. PULVERMACHER'S GALVANIC ESTABLISHMENT,

194, REGENT STREET, London, W.

ESTABLISHED 1851.

BIRKBECK BANK. — Southampton-buildings, Chancery-lane.

Current Accounts opened according to the usual practice of other Bankers, and Interest allowed on the minimum monthly balances when not drawn below £25. No commission charged for keeping Accounts.

The Bank also receives money on Deposit at Three per cent. Interest, repayable on demand.

The Bank undertakes for its Customers, free of charge, the custody of Deeds, Writings, and other Securities and Valuables; the Collection of Bills of Exchange, Dividends, and Coupons; and the purchase and sale of Stocks and Shares.

Letters of Credit and Circular Notes issued.

A Pamphlet, with full particulars, on application.

FRANCIS RAVENSCROFT, Manager.

31st March, 1880.

The Birkbeck Building Society's Annual Receipts exceed Four Millions.

HOW to PURCHASE a HOUSE for TWO GUINEAS PER MONTH, with immediate Possession and no Rent to pay. Apply at the office of the BIRKBECK BUILDING SOCIETY.

HOW to PURCHASE a PLOT of LAND for FIVE SHILLINGS PER MONTH, with immediate possession, either for Building or Gardening purposes. Apply at the Office of the BIRKBECK FREEHOLD LAND SOCIETY.

A Pamphlet, with full particulars, on application.

FRANCIS RAVENSCROFT, Manager.

Southampton Buildings, Chancery Lane.

LATEST NEWS.

We understand that the Deanery of Windsor has been offered to Dr. Liddell, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford.

The offer was, we believe, conveyed in the early part of this week in a letter from Her Majesty the Queen.

At Oxford it is thought not improbable that Dr. Liddell will take advantage of the opportunity to retire from his present position to one of comparative repose.

We deeply regret to have to announce Dr. Liddon's resignation of the Ireland Professorship of Exegesis of Holy Scripture at Oxford. His letter of resignation was placed in the Vice-Chancellor's hands a few days ago.

For some time past it has been an open secret that Dr. Liddon's intention was to maintain his connection with the University only during Dr. Pusey's lifetime.

It is generally believed that Dr. Liddon will be succeeded by Mr. John Wordsworth, Tutor and late Fellow of Brasenose.

We understand that Dr. Liddon will at once commence the work of writing a Life of Dr. Pusey.

The post of organist of Magdalen College, Oxford, vacant by the departure of Mr. Parratt to Windsor, is not yet definitely filled up.

We believe that the appointment will not improbably be offered to Dr. Roberts, of Halifax. Mr. Selby, the organist of Salisbury Cathedral, is also a candidate.

The article in the *Church Quarterly Review* on Mr. T. Mozley's *Reminiscences* is understood to be from the pen of Mr. Beresford-Hope, M.P.

The Emperor of Austria last week paid his first visit to Mgr. the Comte de Chambord at Frohsdorf. His Majesty appeared in full uniform, attended by a numerous suite. This event is considered very significant in Royalist circles.

A series of Royalist banquets is announced to be held before the 15th inst., at St. Anne, Lille, Amiens, Arras, Bordeaux, Montpellier, Carpentras, Lyons, Limoges, and other places.

A Royalist correspondent writes:—"The visit of the Vendeans has given Monseigneur an opportunity of refuting the preposterous statement that he does not wish to come back."

We hear it stated that Sir John Pope Hennessy will shortly return to Irish public life.

We are glad to learn from Rome that the truth about the Irish Land League is now thoroughly understood at the Vatican; and that no efforts will be spared on the part of the Pope to bring about a better state of things in Ireland.

We congratulate the recently formed Roman Catholic Conservative Association on the success which, as we learn, has already attended the efforts of its promoters. Every week a large number of new members is being enlisted; and at its present rate of progress the Association will soon become a real power for good, especially amongst the Irish voters.

The "Liberal Catholics" who write letters in the *Tablet* in opposition to the new society, have evidently two things to learn—1st, that the modern Radical party is in close and intimate alliance with Socialist scoundrelism, Atheism, Anarchy, and the anti-Christian Revolution generally; and 2ndly, that for professing Catholics to join themselves to such a combination as this is simply to commit political suicide.

We write as Tories and Churchmen; but we know that the time has come for all those to draw together who believe in a Supernatural Government of the world.

A private and friendly letter from a Tipperary farmer of known "Nationalist" sympathies, dated from Cashel, and addressed to his brother in England, declares that the tyranny of the Land League in that party of the country is daily more dreaded and more hated. The poorer farmers are forced by sheer terrorism to contribute funds which, they know perfectly well, will be used either to pay for murders, or to fee counsel to defend assassins.

We hear that the treasurer of the Land League, Mr. P. Egan, has good reasons for remaining in Paris, out of the reach of British law. It is thought that the reasons alluded to are not wholly unconnected with the objects to which the funds of the Land League have been applied in Ireland.

We hear from a well-informed Dublin source that a lively "scene" is expected to take place in the coming "National" Convention to be held in Dublin this month.

The subject of dispute will be the administration of the Land League funds, of which only a sum of £25,000 is, we hear, remaining, and which certain independent members are determined to demand shall be given up by the Treasurer.

The explanation, which we offered last week as the most probable one, of the recent change of attitude on the part of the Land League journals with respect to supporting Mr. Gladstone on the question of the *clôture*, is now found, according to our latest information, to be correct.

As we originally stated, a new compact was, it appears, concluded between Mr. Parnell and the Liberal Government. But the former is unable to carry his party with him—notably Mr. Dillon, as we said at the outset, before there was any mention of Mr. Dillon's retirement.

Mr. Parnell has, then, failed in his attempt, owing to his allies' refusal to sanction it. Mr. Dillon secedes; Mr. R. Power resigns his office of Whip. In fact—as we hear—the Parnellite group seems to be breaking up.

Our opinion is that Mr. Parnell's leadership is doomed. "Money made him," writes a correspondent, "and the dollars are no longer coming in—at least to *him*. Whatever money comes in now is being used for other purposes, by more advanced and more honest men."

The ruffianly attack on Lady Florence Dixie which appears in the current number of Mr. Parnell's paper, the *Irishman*, is an outrage on a blameless and excellent lady, to which the fittest reply would be the vigorous and unsparing application of a stout ash-stick.

The writer of that attack knew perfectly well, when he penned it, that a mere breach of Court *étiquette* in the matter of ostrich-plumes was the actual origin of the incident, upon which he bases his malignant and groundless insinuations.

It is not exactly prudent of Mr. Parnell's organ to suggest a topic connected with feathers. Anything which suggests the idea of showing the white feather partakes of the nature of a personal allusion to its proprietor.

We are surprised at the license accorded to the Irish journals which week by week sow the rankest sedition amongst the people. The *Irishman*, under cover of describing a French caricature, offers a gross insult to the Queen; while *United Ireland* ventures to go even farther in the same direction by means of an atrocious cartoon on its front page.

We fear that Mr. A. R. Fawcett's speech at the Church Congress on Thursday illustrates only too well what it was that was meant by the senders of the Ultra-Low Church circular of last week, when they declared that their intention was distinctly not to benefit the Congress.

Mr. Fawcett was, of course, aware that the language he thought fit to use about the Holy Eucharist was intensely shocking to probably the majority of the meeting, in whose eyes it would appear unspeakably profane. If such speeches were to be permitted in future the Congress could not continue to be held. Nor would it be desirable that it should be.

At a meeting of the Consultative Committee, it was decided, on the motion of Mr. Beresford Hope, to hold the Church Congress next year at Reading.

We are glad to learn that there has been no material change in the condition of the Archbishop of Canterbury during the week. He is free from any other suffering than that which follows from muscular weakness.

An Oxford correspondent writes:—"Mr. Jackson's new buildings at Brasenose are nearly completed. They form a handsome and important addition to the College. When they are inhabited, the old block of buildings known as 'No. 9' will be taken down; but the old kitchen is to remain standing."

The same correspondent complains of the effect which the tall new buildings, erected by Mr. Jackson at Lincoln, have on the front "quad" at Brasenose. They are built of stone and red brick, and tower above the old buildings at B.N.C.

CAIRO, Oct. 6.

Sir Auckland Colvin, who is now on his way to Egypt, is instructed not to resume at present his duties as British Comptroller-General.

Baker Pasha is preparing a scheme which includes both the reorganisation of the Egyptian army and the organisation of a gendarmerie. The outlines of this scheme, which is declared to be of a comprehensive character, will shortly be ready, the details being left for a later period.

The Egyptian Government has not up to the present asked England to permit recruiting for the gendarmerie in India; but it is considered probable that the request if made would be granted.

The detachment of the Berkshire Regiment stationed at Tanta has returned to Alexandria, owing to sickness. The Christians at Tanta have petitioned for protection, but the Egyptian Government deem it unnecessary.

The Duke of Teck and Colonel Ewart have embarked for England in the *Lydian Monarch.*

ALEXANDRIA, Oct. 6.

A squadron of the Royal Horse Guards (Blue) embarked to-day on board the *Lydian Monarch*, and a squadron of the 1st Life Guards on board the *Assyrian Monarch.*

A tourist river steamer has arrived at Alexandria with ninety sick, and another with sixty on board is momentarily expected. The comfort of the invalids was well attended to, and the experiment of bringing them in those steamers is regarded as a success.

The *Viking* is embarking the sick. At the Ramleh Hospital there are eighty cases of typhoid fever, and diarrhœa is prevalent.

Aboukir is occupied by artillerymen and Damietta by the Malta Fencibles.

CONSTANTINOPLE, Oct. 6.

There has been a wild rumour floating about for the last twenty-four hours that Lord Granville has recommended Tewfik to enlist Mahommedans from Bombay and Bengal in the new army about to be formed by Baker Pasha.

The experts who have visited the cotton fields report that there is a loss of about one-third of the crops.

BERNE, Oct. 6.

Much excitement is prevailing in Switzerland over the proposal of the ex-President of the Executive Council, M. Schenck, to undenominationalize the educational system of the country. M. Schenck declares that religion is the enemy of progress, and that no clerical teachers of any sect must be allowed. His proposal, however, does not appear at present to find many supporters, and already over 200,000 votes *ad referendum* have been recorded against it. The official declaration of the final result of the voting will be made known on November 29.

ST. PETERSBURG, Oct. 6.

Lieutenant-Colonel Goune, the Military Attaché to the British Embassy, has gone on leave of absence. After visiting Moscow and Constantinople he will proceed to England, and it is believed that he will not return to his post here. Mr. Mitchell, the British Consul at St. Petersburg, has been absent on leave, but has now returned and resumed his functions.

Telegraphing on Thursday night, the Cairo correspondent of the *Daily News* says:—

Owing to the additional information I have received on the subject, I feel justified in giving a report which I heard before, but hesitated to repeat then, that the Khedive has decisively said the execution of Arabi is necessary for the peace of the country. Sherif Pasha is also understood to share his Highness's views on this matter. The fate of Arabi will soon be decided, the Pasha having been made over this morning to the Egyptian authorities, but he is still under an English guard. With regard to the execution it is only too likely that Arabi and his chief associates will be convenient scapegoats for high personages in Turkey and Egypt in danger of being compromised on account of their secret conduct in the late complications.

SOCIETY.

The marriage of Sir Maurice FitzGerald, Bart., Knight of Kerry, Equerry to his Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, K.G., with Miss Lily Bischoffsheim, younger daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Bischoffsheim, took place at Christ Church, Mayfair, on Wednesday forenoon, in the presence of numerous relatives and personal friends. The bridegroom was attended by Major Talbot Crosbie (King's Royal Rifles), as best man. On the arrival of the bride at half-past eleven she was received by her father and four attendant bridesmaids—namely, Miss Sheila and Miss Eileen FitzGerald, sisters of the bridegroom, and Miss Louisa Goldschmidt and Miss Elsa Stern, cousins of the bride, and was at once conducted to the Sacrarium, where Sir Maurice had taken his place. The bride wore a dress of cream white Indian muslin trimmed with flounces of old Brussels lace, sprays of orange blossom in her hair, and Brussels lace veil. The bridesmaids' dresses were also of white Indian muslin, trimmed with lace, the two elder ladies wearing small white bonnets, and the children large plush hats and ostrich feathers. Each wore a gold chain bracelet, with the monogram "M.L." in diamonds hanging like a badge, the gift of the bridegroom. The marriage service was solemnised by the Rev. Henry Bell, vicar of Muncaster, Cumberland, and rural dean. Afterwards the wedding party breakfasted at Mr. and Mrs. Bischoffsheim's residence, Bute House, South Audley-street, when among the guests were the Earl and Countess of Desart, the Countess Howe, Elizabeth Countess of Desart, Viscount and Viscountess Lismore, Viscountess Mandeville, Lord Rowton and Miss Corry, Lady Margaret Beaumont and Miss Weyland, Lady Blanche Edwardes, M. de Hengelmüller (Austrian Chargé d'Affaires), Hon. Mrs. Oliphant, Captain Hon. O. Cuffe, Hon. A. Welsh, Sir George and Lady Colthurst, Dowager Lady Colthurst and Miss Colthurst, Lady Sykes, Sir Henry Meysey Thompson, Colonel and Mrs. Keith Fraser, Major Egerton, Mr. Alfred de Rothschild, Mr. Henry Calcraft, Mr. Clayton, Mr. Alfred Montgomery, Mrs. St. John Mildmay, the Rev. Henry Bell, Mr. and Mrs. Goldschmidt, Mr. and Mrs. Langenbach, Mr. Brinsley FitzGerald, Mr. Percy Drummond, Mr. and Mrs. James Stern, and Mr. Biedermann. About half-past two o'clock Sir Maurice and his bride started on their way to Valentia, Sir Maurice's ancestral home in Ireland, where they intend to pass the early days of the honeymoon. The bride's travelling dress was of drab beige and brown velvet, with hat to match. The wedding presents, which were displayed on several tables in one of the principal drawing-rooms, were numerous. The Duke and Duchess of Connaught sent a silver salver; and Prince Leopold (Duke of Albany) a walrus claret jug. The Knight of Kerry's presents to his bride included a string of pearls, ruby, emerald, two diamond and turquoise rings, a pearl pin, a chatelain and belt, and a water-colour picture of Valentia, her future home in Ireland. Mrs. Bischoffsheim presented her daughter with, amongst other presents, a complete set of plate with centre piece and dessert stands. Major Buchanan, Major Bagot, Captain Bathurst, Mr. W. Percy Drummond, Mr. C. Hunter, and Mr. Wegg Prosser, of the 60th Rifles, in which regiment Sir Maurice formerly served, sent him on the occasion of his marriage a case of silver-mounted drinking cups, knives and forks, &c., and the servants at Bute House presented the bride with a silver tea and coffee set.

At the Bavarian Chapel, Warwick-street, was solemnised, on the 12th ult., the marriage of Mr. Ulric Charlton, third son of the late Mr. Charlton, of Hesleyside, and Miss Alice Whitgreave, only surviving child of the late Mr. Henry Whitgreave, of Moseley Court, Stafford. The bridegroom came early, accompanied by his brother, Mr. Ernest Charlton, of Burgwallis Hall, Doncaster, as best man. The bride, who wore a dress of ivory broché satin, a veil of Brussels lace, and diamond and pearl ornaments, was attended by Master Edward Lisle Strutt as page, attired in a costume of brown velvet, with point lace collar. The marriage service was solemnised by the Right Rev. W. Clifford, Bishop of Clifton, assisted by the Rev. Father Leslie, S.J., and the Rev. E. Egan. The ceremony over, the wedding party and friends left the church and proceeded to the Hotel Continental, Regent-street, where breakfast was served to a large party, including the Hon. Mrs. Strutt, Sir Adrian and Lady Dingli, Mrs. Edward Charlton, Mr. Frank Whitgreave, the Misses Selby (of Biddleston), Mr. Edwin de Lisle, Mr. George Eyston, Mr. Ernest Charlton Miss Charlton, &c.

The marriage of the Rev. Alex. Freeman, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and rector of Murston, Kent, with Miss Eva Paterson, youngest daughter of the late Colonel Paterson, and granddaughter of the late General Sir William Paterson, K.C.H., took place on Wednesday morning at St. Matthew's, Porchester-gate. The bride, who was given away by her brother, Major Paterson, Prince of Wales's Regiment, wore a dress of ivory satin, with train of broché, trimmed with lace and orange blossoms, diamond and pearl ornaments. She was attended by four bridesmaids, dressed in crimson satin and broché. In the afternoon the bride and bridegroom left for Dover, *en route* for the Continent.

DOUBLE ACROSTIC.

A prize of £3 3s. in money will be given at the end of each quarter to the solver of the greatest number of our Double Acrostics during the thirteen weeks. Solutions must reach the office not later than the Monday week following the date of publication, and must be signed with a distinct pseudonym, of not inordinate length. Ties will be guessed off the following quarter. Solutions must be addressed ACROSTIC EDITOR, *John Bull*, 6, Whitefriars-street, Fleet-street. Alternatives allowed to the number of three: anyone sending more to a single light will not be credited. In the case of a quotation, the word intended by the author must be given, even if others should answer the sense of the light.

ANSWER TO DOUBLE ACROSTIC, No. 5.

(TWENTY-SEVENTH QUARTER.)

1. P rim E
2. E alin G
3. A rm Y
4. C rup P
5. E legan T

NOTES.—Light 1: Baring-Gould, "Three Crowns." Light 4: David Copperfield.

Correct solutions have been received from Cousins, Etak, Hadji, Iris, Jib, Knole, Katydid, Ketha, Land-o'-Nod, Maud, Mrs. Mums, Noremac, Peowit, Persevere, Pussoat-mew, Roma, and Spero.—17 correct, 28 incorrect; total 45.

The quarterly Prize has been gained by Mrs. HENRY HYAT COLLINGS (Spero), Osborne Villa, Cumberland-road, Bristol.

ALGA.—You gave "Scone" instead of "Stonehenge."

ZENOBIA.—There is little doubt that Stonehenge was a ring for Parliamentary and coronation purposes. The idea that it was anterior to the Roman occupation of Great Britain is disposed of by the discovery of Roman coins under several of the stones.

BRUCE.—The lines are to be found in Drydon's epistle to Dr. Charlton on Stonehenge.

The Editor cannot see that any of the alternatives to this light fulfil the conditions of a site once thought to be a temple, subsequently found to be a place of coronation.

Edyrn was the "Sparrow Hawk" of Enid and Geraint.

KIDDLE-A-WINK.—Yourself and any other contributor who was deterred from sending an answer to No. 4 Acrostic by the admitted inaccuracy of the light "Ironmonger," will be permitted to send answers to the two Acrostics inserted in the 13th week of the quarter—a privilege usually reserved for those who have written one.

DOUBLE ACROSTIC, No. 7.

(TWENTY-SEVENTH QUARTER.)

PROEM.

Two terms which are oft as synonymous used,
By careful housewives hated and abused,
And yet a measure of my first, in spring,
Is worth, 'tis said, the ransom of a king;
And everyone a measure of my last,
Must eat, old nurses say, 'ere life be past.

1.

You hear this word, and straight before your eyes,
Visions of slaves and dismal swamps arise.

2.

A patriot's home, in whom we once believed,
Though as a myth his deeds are now received.

3.

The jolly knight for two and thirty years
Claimed to have fed this with appropriate fires.

4.

In his wise counsel to the courtly player,
Of outdoing this, the Prince bade him beware.

G.

The *Newcastle Chronicle* designates the Premier's speech at Penmaenmawr as arrant cant, and says:—"Had any other mortal man pretended to deliver himself of the will of heaven it would have been termed blasphemous presumption, and had he called the horrors of war the love of peace it would have been called hypocrisy. We do not believe in this case that it is either. But we believe it to be a misguided sincerity, at the mercy of arrant cant. Cant is a bad thing, and it points to worse things beneath it. It is like the beetle of 'droning flight,' solemn of demeanour, and sonorous of tone, whose dazzling metallic lustre is unexampled among living things, but which draws its nourishment from the dung heaps, whence it sprang, and whither it returns. Had the British public taken thought to look behind the canting phrases that have been current these few years back, despotism in the name of liberty would not have overwhelmed Ireland, slavery in the name of freedom North Borneo, prejudice in the name of truth Albania, nor a bloody war in the name of peace Egypt."

Printed and Published by THOMAS DIXON, at the Office, No. 6, Whitefriars-street, Fleet-street.—Saturday, Oct. 7, 1882.

SUPPLEMENT TO

JOHN BULL.

"FOR GOD, THE SOVEREIGN, AND THE PEOPLE!"

Registered at the General Post Office as a Newspaper.

VOL. LXII.
No. 3,229.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1882.

GRATIS.

The Church Congress.

On Tuesday the 22nd annual Church Congress was held at Derby. No preface is needed to explain the object of these gatherings; but some details quoted from the *Derby Mercury* may interest our readers:—

"The Congress may be said to have practically commenced on Sunday, when some distinguished preachers occupied our pulpits, among whom may be mentioned the Archdeacon of Ely, the painstaking, courteous General Secretary, who pleaded for the Southwell Bishopric; the Bishop of Nelson, who pleaded for missionary wants which have so great a claim on those who live at home at ease; and Minor Canon Shuttleworth (the son of Canon Shuttleworth, rector of Egloshayle, Cornwall), who is a rising preacher, is possessed of no mean literary powers, and has great influence over young men. On Monday a number of extra-Congressional meetings took place, and the local branch of the S.P.G. not unnaturally desired to utilise the presence of the junior member for the University of Cambridge, by putting him in the chair at their gathering; but it was hardly fair to Mr. Beresford-Hope to let him address so small an audience, as was almost inevitably the case, from the hour when the meeting was held. In the evening there were crowded meetings of the friends of the Free and Open Church and Temperance causes, and though there is little new to be said on subjects which have been so thoroughly threshed out, the interest no doubt was sustained by earnest advocates of both. There was a useful discussion of details of Sunday-school work in St. Werburgh's Schools, under the presidency of the Archdeacon of Derby.

"On Tuesday the bells of various churches ringing for early service testified that something unusual was going on in our midst, and soon after 10.30 both All Saints' and St. Alkmund's were crowded with worshippers. The service was the same in both churches, appropriate psalms and lessons being chosen. The Mayor and Corporation attended All Saints' in state, and the Bishops of Winchester, Liverpool, Nassau, and Nelson were in the procession, while at St. Alkmund's the Bishop of Bedford preceded the Bishop of Truro, who was appropriately followed by (besides his two chaplains) the Right Hon. A. J. B. Beresford-Hope, M.P., the great mover in support of the increase of the Episcopate, who sees the work of his hands before him in the presence at the Congress of two Bishops of new Sees, to say nothing of suffragans. The sermons were worthy of the occasion. That of the Archbishop of York dealt with a subject which his Grace has made eminently his own—viz., the prevalence of Pantheism and Materialism; while the Bishop of Truro riveted the attention of his hearers as he dissected the new Paganism which would substitute the human for the Divine. He observed that thought rules policy, not policy thought, and quoted the works of Bishop Connop Thirlwall, in 1832, as to the impossibility of reforming the Church, because she was fighting for her very existence. He surveyed the destructive forces which were arrayed against the Church, pointed out the evils of undue repression, and the satisfactory features of religious progress as evidenced, not merely by restored churches and other signs of internal progress, but by the zeal of many Nonconformist bodies themselves for Catholic and even ascetic principles. Not the least happy portions of a very deep discourse were those which spoke of the tendency to think lightly of property held by corporations, and of an aristocracy being converted into a plutocracy. A service of an extra-Congressional character was held simultaneously at St. Michael's, but the Dean of York, who gave an excellent sermon to a small congregation, would have been more in his place, as the leading dignitary in priest's orders in the Northern Province, in the procession of civil and ecclesiastical functionaries who walked from the Townhall to the church and back, conspicuous among all being the handsome form of the Bishop of Liverpool towering above his well-made and well-preserved Metropolitan.

"The Drill Hall was filled to its utmost capacity at two o'clock, when the President delivered his inaugural address. As one looked round one noticed many familiar Congress faces besides that of the Archdeacon of Ely, who, fatiguing as a Congress week is to him, is always its light and its soul. Earl Nelson, who is as true to the Church as his great ancestor was to the State, was to the fore; the junior member for the University of Cambridge seemed more beaming than ever in a diocese with which, next to Canterbury, he is more closely associated than with London or Ely; Sir Percival Heywood, the munificent supporter of middle-class education, now rendered additionally famous by being patron of St. John's, Miles Platting; Dr. Townshend, the son of the famous Canon of Durham, who went to Rome to convert the Pope, and himself no bad specimen of the courteous old cleric fast passing, alas! from our midst; the Rev. Wm. H. Hoare, the Squ'arson of Sussex, the brother of Henry Hoare, the first worker in favour of lay co-operation; Canon Lefroy, of Liverpool, an eloquent and cultured evangelical, who still officiates in one of the ugliest of buildings, with the barest of services, after much Congress experience; these and a host more of representative men were to be seen together with many other veteran leaders, and also a strong force of the rank and file of every school of thought in the Church; and as with one heart and one voice they joined in the Apostles' Creed, the thought came uppermost to the mind that, amidst much apparent diversity, there was a substantial unity of opinion."

The Congress opened at two o'clock, at the Drill Hall, which was crowded to excess—many being unable to find admission, in consequence of which the President's Address was re-delivered by his Lordship at the Temperance Hall. The proceedings commenced with prayer, after which it was announced that in consequence of the number of season tickets taken no further day tickets would be issued.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

The **President** (the Bishop of Lichfield) delivered his inaugural address in the Drillhall to a crowded audience, and prefaced his prepared oration with the following allusion to the Archbishop of Canterbury:

My Lord Archbishop, my right rev. brethren, and my fellow Churchmen,—You will not be surprised if, before I begin my inaugural address, I ask you to turn your thoughts for a moment from this scene to a distant sick-bed, where a life very precious to the English Church is hard pressed by the inroads of a dangerous disease, and where motherless children are watching beside a suffering father. You will rejoice with me in the more favourable accounts which are now reaching us from day to day—(applause)—for you will feel with me that the Church of England could ill afford to lose that large heart, that powerful intellect, and that statesmanlike capacity which God has given to us in our present Primate. (Applause.) You will forgive me if I ask you to rise up before God and to join with me for a moment in special prayer on behalf of our good Archbishop. (Applause.)

A special prayer was then offered. The Bishop then proceeded with his address as follows:—

I bid you welcome to the diocese of Lichfield and to this ancient town of Derby. Twice before—once at Wolverhampton under good Bishop Lonsdale, and again at Stoke under the great Bishop Selwyn—*par nobile patrum*—the Congress has been received and welcomed in this diocese. To-day the welcome is not less hearty, although it comes from less worthy lips. We value highly the unique honour thus bestowed upon our diocese, and earnestly hope that the Congress may have no cause to regret the selection it has made. But this honour brings with it a great responsibility. It is no easy work, either for the Bishop or his colleagues, to make such arrangements as will ensure success. And if, as regards myself, the labour has been less arduous than it might have been, it is owing to the energy and the loyalty with which I have been assisted by the local secretaries and the various committees; and to them I desire now, in your presence, to offer my hearty thanks. Our work has been by no means free of difficulty, and we can hardly hope to have succeeded in giving satisfaction to all whom it concerns. Already we have received a good deal of criticism, not always favourable, but of this we have no wish to complain. No man in public affairs ought either to despise or to resent the expression of public opinion. He ought not to be afraid of it; he need not be flattered by it, but he should estimate it at its proper value. It is, I think, due to the members of the Congress that I should give them some account of the course which we have followed in preparing for their deliberations. The selection of subjects and of speakers is always one of difficulty and of delicacy. There seems, indeed, at first sight to be an almost unlimited choice; numberless subjects and numberless readers and speakers, but practically this is far from being the case. Many subjects of great interest and importance are quite unsuited for public discussion. They need a more deliberate study and a calmer consideration, and they are better dealt with in the form of books than in detached papers, or else in private conference rather than in public debate. And, again, as regards the persons who might be expected to render assistance at such meetings as these, there are some indeed who are always ready and always willing, true and tried friends of the Church and of the Congress, and many of them we welcome among us to-day; but there are many more who for various reasons, from excessive occupation, or sometimes excessive modesty, the exigencies of public business or the claims of private affairs, are unable to accept the invitations which are addressed to them to take part in these proceedings. Complaints are not infrequently made that in every Congress there is a repetition of the same subjects and the reappearance of the same speakers. In some measure no doubt this is true, although we venture to hope that in our present programme many of these familiar subjects are at least regarded from some unaccustomed point of view. But the truth is that the same may be said to a large extent of the proceedings of other meetings as well as ours, and even of the Houses of Parliament themselves. There, too, the same questions recur again and again through a long succession of years, while the number of those who speak, and, still more, the number of those to whom either House will listen, is comparatively small. The reason of this is not far to seek. There are certain subjects so continuous in their interest, and so momentous as regards the well-being of the State on the one hand or of the Church on the other, that in some form or other, and to suit the changeful circumstances of the time, they must again and again come under discussion; while there are certain persons of prominent position, of exceptional gifts, or of unusual experience, whose words are always expected and valued, and whose absence would be a matter of regret. As regards the Church Congress, it is further to be remembered that, although the same persons may speak again and again, they speak each year to a different audience. From various causes we have had this year exceptional difficulties. It was hardly to be expected that many members of the Legislature should give up to the Congress so much of their short but well-deserved leisure with the near prospect of an autumn session assembling before the month is over. All the more do we thank those who have come to us even at this sacrifice; but many others, as we know, are most unwillingly absent. I feel assured that it is from no want of interest in our work. But if (which would not be fitting) the names of those were made public who had received invitations from myself or from the Committee, it would, I think, be seen that we had at least endeavoured to enlist our speakers not only from among Church dignitaries and Church officials, but among statesmen and soldiers, physicians and lawyers, and all sorts and conditions of men. As regards our choice of subjects, we have endeavoured to select those which appeared to have at the present time some new aspect or some special importance. In others we have ventured to suggest some special method of treatment; in all cases we have desired to deal with great principles rather than subordinate details. This will, I trust, appear, not only from the programme, but still more from the papers and addresses themselves. I will illustrate my meaning by one or two examples. Take the subject which comes before us this evening—the evangelistic work of the Church. It has, of course, been often before considered. But recent inquiries as to Church attendance, and recent movements of a remarkable kind, give the subject a new and powerful interest at the present time. Again, we have no doubt discussed very fully on previous occasions the question of Church discipline, but mostly in relation to what are called ritual offences; to-night, in another place, we ask your attention to a branch of the subject which, in my judgment, is of far greater and more urgent importance—that of criminous and negligent clergy; along with which we have placed the consideration of another matter about which much is said but little seems to be understood—I mean canonical obedience. Again, as regards the Church and modern thought, we have desired to recognise the legitimate place of what is called free thought even in matters of religion, but on the other hand to limit its sphere by the claims of authority; while in the matter of science and faith we have intended not only to repeat the assertion of their necessary harmony, but to show how much religious truth itself has been illustrated and enriched by the discoveries of science. And once more, under the subject of the political relations of the Church, we have indicated the important distinction too often forgotten between the Church and Crown, and the Church and Parliament. To one other matter I must for a moment ask your attention. You will observe that at two meetings of an exceptional character it has been arranged to consider the subject of the legal protection of the young. Recent revelations before a Committee of the House of Lords have shown how urgently it is needed that something should be done in this direction, and although it is scarcely in accordance with the traditions of the Church Congress, we have thought it right to invite a gifted woman—well qualified for the task—to tell the tale of misery and shame which so loudly calls upon the Church to utter her voice in defence of her tempted and unprotected children. It is on such principles and with such purposes that our selection has been made. Let me say further that we have had no wish whatever to avoid what are called burning questions, although we should not have been willing to introduce, without necessity, occasions of discord. But, indeed, many of these questions need scarcely now be viewed with alarm. If they have not ceased to burn, at least they no longer blaze. It is when the fire is first lighted or rekindled that there is most smoke and most flame. It has been thought desirable at some former meetings of the Church Congress to call attention to the special circumstances and needs of the diocese in which for the time the Congress holds its meetings. We have not thought it necessary to make this a subject for discussion, but it must not be altogether passed by. Among our many needs in the diocese of Lichfield there is one which at the present time demands immediate attention—a necessity long foreseen, and now recognised by the Legislature—I mean the subdivision of the diocese by the creation of the Bishopric of Southwell. It is now four years since the Act was passed which sanctioned this arrangement—a similar provision being made for the creation of the dioceses of Liverpool, Newcastle, and Wakefield. Of these the first was already nearly ripe for its formation, and since then the diocese of Newcastle has also been constituted. In each of these cases there were powerful and wealthy friends of the Church, who, by generous donations of unusual magnitude, were able to hasten forward the completion of the work. It has not been so with us. A considerable number of the residents and owners in this diocese have contributed to our fund as liberally as could well be expected during times of great agricultural distress, as well as depression of trade. But we have raised little more than half of the £70,000 which we require for our purpose. I will not trouble you with further details, as a meeting is to be held on Friday next, when our present position will be fully explained. But it has seemed to us that now, when the prospect, thanks be to God, would appear to be brightening, both in agriculture and in trade, a vigorous effort ought to be made to complete this good work, and that a new beginning should date from the time of this Congress. I need not occupy your time by insisting on the enormous advantage which would be gained, not only by this diocese but also by that of my revered brother of Lincoln, through the creation of this new bishopric; but I think that you will allow that a diocese like that of Lichfield, which contains 1,000 clergy and a million and a half of people, and which stretches from Derby to the borders of Wales, and from Birmingham to Buxton, stands urgently in need of subdivision if ever its works is to be done with such efficiency and completeness as all of us, and most of all its own Bishop, would desire. Is it too much to hope that before another Church Congress shall assemble the work may be done? And now it may be asked, "What end is to be served by all these preparations?" It has been sometimes said, and no doubt it will be said again before many days are over, that the Church Congress is a mere debating society; that it takes no practical steps; that it initiates no new measures; that the discussions are fruitless, and often unreal. Now, what is the meaning of these criticisms, and how far are they just? If it be meant that the Church Congress effects no immediate settlement of burning controversies, and that it inaugurates no definite schemes of practical work, this cannot be denied. This is not the function of the Congress. For purposes of legislation and of action the Church has her ancient synods and her constituted authorities. But it is not, therefore, by any means destitute of practical results, and these of a very valuable kind. First of all discussion is always fruitful in good if it serves to clear away misapprehension, to strengthen true conviction, or to stir men's minds and hearts to greater interest in their duties or greater earnestness in their work. The practical result may not appear in a manifesto or a resolution, or in the prospectus of a new Church Society, nor in the outburst of a new religious movement; but it is found in a clearer grasp of truth, a deepened sense of responsibility, and not least in a feeling of brotherhood, a deeper realisation of the communion of saints. And it is from minds and hearts thus elevated and strengthened, and stirred, that there spring forth, not in the arena of the Congress, but in widely scattered homes and distant spheres of labour, new efforts and agencies, ventures of faith, and works of love. I am firmly convinced that many a man and many a woman who has come to a Church Congress only to listen to the discussion of certain interesting topics has gone home with the whole soul kindled by a sympathetic fire to begin some new work, or to labour with a new power and earnestness. But, besides this, there is a most real gain of a more general kind. In an age like ours, specially marked by its independent thought and intellectual activity, it is impossible but that there should be strongly marked divergencies of thought in matters of religion. It is true, indeed, that no age has been free from them, not even the Apostolic times—nay, we may fairly add, not even the Apostles themselves. No one can thoughtfully read the Apostolic Epistles without being conscious of a tendency on the part of the writers to regard the fundamental truths of the Gospel from different points of view, and to dwell more or less exclusively on that aspect of Christianity which had most powerfully laid hold on their minds. It would not be impossible for a scoffing spirit even to affix our modern party names to some of these writers themselves. It is true that, under the special control of the Holy Spirit, these divergences did not issue either in dissensions or divisions, but none the less did they exist. Nor can we fail to observe in these writings indications of the existence of such differences among the body of the believers. But mark the admirable spirit in which St. Paul gives counsel concerning them. "If in anything ye be differently minded (Εἴ τι ἑτέρως φρονεῖτε), God will reveal to you this also." Differences must exist, because we are human, but the truth is one, because it is divine; and one most helpful means to neutralise these divergences is to bring men together to take counsel concerning them in a spirit of brotherly love, where each may help to supply what is lacking in the other, and to receive what is lacking in himself. And so it is in such a gathering as this. We bring together, as in the sight of God, and for the general good, our various thoughts and experiences, the outcome of our various characters and circumstances—our gifts of nature and our gifts of grace—fulfilling in our measure that prophetic picture drawn for us by St. Paul, of the building up of the body of Christ, as it is "compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part." In such a spirit and with such a hope let us enter upon the work of the Congress. Let us remember that we are here not to further nor to protect the interest of any party, but to advance the cause of truth and to inquire after the ways of wisdom. We meet face to face as brother men, brother Christians, brother Churchmen; not to oppose each other, but to understand each other; not confirm our prejudices, bu to adjust our differences. Without such intercourse divergences too easily become dissensions and deepen into divisions. It is often alleged that at meetings like these we are apt to suppress our differences, and to make believe that we are all of one mind. This is certainly not my experience of Church Congresses. Again and again I have heard from both sides the boldest expressions of opinion upon subjects concerning which men differ most widely; only with this happy change, becoming more apparent from year to year, that whereas some ten or fifteen years ago such utterances not unfrequently called forth from the audience expressions of violent disapprobation, we have now learned to listen with patience to much which we may not appreciate or approve. I trust, and I do not doubt, that it will be so in this Congress. Let every man say boldly, but kindly, what he believes that God has taught him: let him speak not in a spirit of defiance, but in a spirit of love; let him eschew all needless expressions which might give offence; let him avoid the temptation to elicit by some party watchword a ringing cheer; above all, let him remember that the grand object which we have in view is the attainment of truth, the discovery of the wisest methods of work, the strengthening of peace among ourselves, the firmer cohesion of the members of the body. By such a course our very differences may serve only to bring out more clearly the unity of our faith and of our desire. We shall learn that we are not so divided as the world believes; that in our beliefs and convictions we are, for the most part, not really opposed to one another, but that some have been led to believe more than their brethren, while all hold fast the great fundamental truths of the Gospel of salvation. We shall see how vastly greater is the basis of our agreement than the comparatively little details round which the fiercest controversies have sometimes raged, and we shall learn, as the Apostle has taught us, "not to judge one another any more, but to judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling-block in his brother's way." May I not add, that the very diversities of thought which find expression at meetings like these are at once a safeguard and a protest against any narrowing of the limits which define the membership of our branch of the Catholic Church? I earnestly trust that the day is far distant when by any such narrowness or exclusiveness we should lose from the Church of England the missionary zeal of a Henry Venn, or the self-sacrificing labours of a Charles Lowder, the varied gifts of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, or the sanctified learning of Edward Bouverie Pusey. A few more words and I have done. And now, as regards our difficulties. Every age of the Church has its own difficulties as well as its own opportunities; we must neither quail before the one nor neglect to use the other. In these matters our own age has its own experience. The vastly increased activities of life leaving less leisure for the things of God; the marvellous progress of science tending to fix men's thoughts upon outward phenomena and natural laws, and to withdraw them from the consideration or recollection of the great First Cause; the tendency of modern legislation to eliminate from national institutions the supports and restraints of religion; the growing resistance to authority and the craving for independence. All these things have become, and will probably continue to be, most serious obstacles and hindrances to the work of the Church of Christ. But if it be true, and we have all known it to be true, that difficulties and trials have often developed in the individual powers and capacities of which he himself had scarcely been conscious till the occasion called them forth, may we not well believe that this will prove true of the Church of Christ, and that even for her "sweet are the uses of adversity?" Whatever difficulties might surround us, whatever changes, political or social, may be in store for us, we may rest assured that they will only give occasion for further developments of the mission of the Church, and fresh manifestations of its spiritual power. The trials and hindrances are part of the appointed discipline of the Church of God, and He rules and controls them all—

> Well roars the storm for him who hears
> A deeper voice above the storm.

But, on the other hand, there are occasions for the triumphs of the Church; splendid opportunities for the exercise of her gifts and for the manifestation of her strength; calls to increased devotion in the service of our Lord and King. A remarkable and generous testimony was recently borne by a leader of one of the great Nonconformist bodies, to the effect that in no age of the Church had there been witnessed a more striking revival of spiritual life than that which has been seen in the Church of England during the last half-century. If this be so, *Soli Deo gloria*. But it is no matter for complacent pride. Rather does it bring with it a deepened responsibility. We cannot doubt that this blessing has been granted to us, as at once a preparation for arduous work and a call to more earnest effort. The Church must be more aggressive in her work if she would be faithful to her Master. Aggressiveness is a true note of the Catholic Church. It was involved in her first commission; it is essential to her very life. We have been strengthening the base of our operations and preparing our armour for the conflict. But the time is come to go forth to battle. There is a mass of sin and indifference around us on every side, and an increasing activity of evil in manifold forms. What a noble work would it be for the Church of England if throughout all her borders a united effort were now to be made in the strength of the Holy Ghost to win for God the masses of the people who are living in ignorance of His love and in subjection to the powers of evil. For the Church is the true Salvation Army, and although we may well thank God for any permanent good effected by the irregular forces which are in motion around us, we have nothing to imitate in them but their earnestness and energy. The Church has her own methods and her own armour, and although she brings out of her treasures things new and old, they are only new in their adaptation to the varying circumstances of each succeeding age. I will not detain you longer from the interesting discussion which will now begin. There is a special fitness in the order in which our subjects come before us. We begin with the recognition and discussion of that which alone renders the Congress possible or desirable—unity of belief in relation to diversity of thought—and we close with the consideration of the two great objects for which the Church itself exists in relation to humanity—the deepening of the spiritual life and the proclamation of the Gospel of Salvation. May the spirit of wisdom and of love be with us all—with those who speak and with those who hear—enlightening our understandings and kindling our affections, subduing our passions, and guiding our speech—that all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and evil-speaking may be put away from us, and that we may be helpers of each other's faith and joy. So may all our deliberations bind us more closely together in the bond of peace, and strengthen us each in our calling to prepare the way of the Lord. It will in all ways be a most fitting prelude to our first discussion if I call upon you now, according to custom, to join with me in saying the Apostles' Creed.

UNITY OF BELIEF IN RELATION TO DIVERSITIES OF THOUGHT.

Immediately after the President's address, the Dean of Wells read the first paper on the above subject:—

Most of us, I imagine, can recall a time when there floated before our minds the vision of a perfect Church, holding the one faith in its completeness, answering from the storehouse of that faith, with its things new and old, the many questions which men ask as to the being and the character and the government of God, and the whence and whither of their own lives. From one point of view Scripture was the rule and limit of belief, so that what "was not read therein nor might be proved thereby was not to be required of any man to be believed as an article of faith;" but experience has shown that that proving process seldom, if ever, attains to the character of demonstration; varies according to the diversities of character and training, and ends in manifold and discordant results. From another standpoint Tradition was to come in as the interpreter of Scripture, checking this tendency to variation, receiving the faith once delivered to the saints, and partially indicated in Scripture, as the basis of what else was found there, and handing it on unbroken and uncorrupted to future generations. It was a pleasant completion of the dream that somehow or other the Church of England was the one faithful representative in the world of this primitive tradition. She alone spoke as with the one unchanging voice of Catholic antiquity. She called to men to stand upon the ancient ways and to walk therein. She alone, erring neither in defect nor in excess, had kept to the "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus" of Vincent of Lorins, and, standing aloof from—

> "Roman and Swiss and Lutheran novelties,"

had taken her *via media* course between the extremes of superstition and denial.

Alas! the vision vanished. The master-wizard who had raised it waved his wand, and instead of that completeness and unity of the faith, that clear and unbroken witness, we were taught to hear only the voice that came from the "stammering lips of ambiguous formularies," and to see nothing but "inconsistent precedents and principles imperfectly developed." The tradition of Anglo-Catholic theology went its way with the proving—from—texts process of Burnett on the Articles. The enchanter, it was true, acted as the hierophant of yet newer mysteries, and, taking the torch of development as his guide, led us into a land of shadows, where all things were ever growing and changing forms, and the thoughts of men were widening with the years. What had before seemed lurid corruptions of the faith, the accretions of logical speculation not content to keep within the limits of the knowable, distortions of half-truths, were now presented to us, guaranteed by the infallible authority which was the postulate of the whole system, as being as much the normal developments of theology as the last discoveries in spectrum analysis or electro-magnetism are the normal developments of science. The idea of such developments had, it cannot be denied, a special fascination of its own. It presented an analogy to the mode in which men attain to truth in other regions of knowledge by patient investigation and wide induction and scientific imagination. If we accepted the postulate it gave us the certainty, and perhaps also the unity, of which we were in search. The first steps of the primer of the *Grammar of Assent* might lead the child-like inquirer to the full-orbed completeness in which the Archimage himself professed to have found the vision of peace and the long-sought goal of his pilgrimage through the many wanderings of thought. But what if we could not accept it? What, if this postulate of an infallible authority was precisely that which our intellect could not honestly admit—at variance alike with Scripture and history, and with the processes of scientific inquiry, which go on their way and take the hazard of mistakes, and appeal to the future rather than the past as their ultimate tribunal; theory giving way to theory in the progress of the centuries, each contributing something to the advance of knowledge, yet none claiming to be exhaustive. In that case, where were we to turn for guidance? Was it to be found in the "verifying faculty" of each man's intellect and conscience? or in the authoritative *dicta* of the "higher criticism," varying as that criticism does from day to day, destroying now what is built up yesterday and then building again the things which it had destroyed?

I have traced the path which many minds in this our time have travelled, and which seems to lead, I frankly admit, to a wide and almost hopeless scepticism. I say "almost" rather than "altogether," for in the midst of these storm-tossed wanderings the restless seeker may have found rest for the sole of his foot on the unshaken rock of duty, which has its roots deep in the conviction of an eternal Law, and even through the mists and darkness he may have been following, consciously or unconsciously, the guidance of the Light that lighteth every man, and stretching out his hands to what to him was as the Unknown God, may have been ignorantly worshipping Him Who is not far from every one of us—the God of the spirits of all flesh, the Father of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named. Not seldom, we may hope, the prayer of the sceptic, which begins "If Thou art, if Thou wilt, if Thou canst," has been translated, in the mystic speech to which the ear of the Eternal is ever open, into the cry, "Lord, I believe, help Thou mine unbelief," and the voice of one who feels himself to be as—

> "An infant crying in the night,
> And with no language but a cry,"

has, though he knew it not, been heard and answered till it has transformed itself into the clearer and more blessed utterance, "I will arise and go to my Father," to "the God of Whom the whole family"—of Whom, rather, every fatherhood—"in heaven and earth is named."

May not those words form the starting-point of a less devious and labyrinthine journey than that which I have traced? They at least carry us back to the fountain-head from which that thought of "the unity of the faith" has flowed, to the Divine word in which for the first time that phrase was heard. It appears there (Eph. iv. 13), not in connection with dogmatic subtleties and formulated systems, but as the outcome of a life, of the life of each individual man as far as he is personally concerned, of the life of that redeemed and renewed humanity, which is ever growing towards the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, to that "perfect man" which is the ultimate goal of the strivings and sufferings of His people, the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus, towards which each man and each generation of men are bound to press forward, forgetting the things which are behind and stretching forth unto those things which are before. Men are to walk worthily of that high calling, "endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." And then that thought of unity expands, and the mind of the Apostle counts up the things which are at once its elements, its grounds, its witnesses—"One body, and one spirit, and one hope of our calling: one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all." Then comes the thought of the manifoldness which is another aspect of the unity—the diversities of gifts and operations, "apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers," which have been given "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ, till we all come," not "*in*," but "*into*, the unity of the faith, and of the knowlege of the Son of God."

I will not dwell on the question, though it well deserves inquiry, whether the "faith," which is thus named, is used in its objective or subjective sense, as the truth which the intellect accepts, or the act of the mind in accepting it, or the implicit confidence of the whole man in God Who reveals the truth. The former meaning appears prominent in the later Epistles of St. Paul as the latter does in the earlier. It may be that, as he used the words, he was not careful to draw the technical distinctions which we draw, and that for him the two meanings implied and intermingled with each other. The trust was co-extensive with the truths which were its object. What I note in either case is that the oneness of the faith appears in two distinct aspects. It is at once the beginning of the Christian life, and its crown and consummation. At first it is elementary and in germ. It is, in the end, the goal to which the whole development of the life of the individual and the Church is ever tending, but which it never, while subject to the conditions of its earthly existence, actually attains. In the meantime its progress and growth are marked by diversities and variations. Tested by experience we may say that it also illustrates the law of progression by antagonism. This or that aspect of the truth is more or less abnormally developed. There seems the risk of the undue distortion of a half-truth and the suppression of that which is its complement. Individual experience, national temperament, the great waves of thought which sweep over the universe of intellect, bring into prominence now this and now that element of the faith. Now the Unity of the Godhead, and now the Trinity of Persons, at one time the Divinity of the Eternal Word, at another His true Humanity, now God's grace, and now man's freedom to will, justification by faith without works, and the truth that without holiness no man shall see the Lord—these present themselves in succession and give rise to the controversies which mark the record of the centuries. Men have been eager, as those controversies disturbed the Church, and seemed to them to threaten the unity of the faith, to guard against the danger by defining and formulating the truths which formed their subject-matter, and often, we may thankfully acknowledge, as with the Nicene Creed, and to some extent even with the Athanasian, the result has been that both aspects of the truth have been more adequately brought out and placed in their right relation to each other. Whether it was wisely done to place those formulæ and definitions on the same level of the "one faith" which is by hypothesis the ground of the life of the individual Christian and of the Church universal, or to assume that they, in the form in which men have cast them, must necessarily be part of that ultimate unity which will blend and harmonise all that had been partial and incomplete, and to insist that these also should be received as articles of faith, because we think that they can be proved by Scripture, or are in agreement with the traditions of a primitive antiquity, is practically, I take it, the question with which I have to deal to-day.

I turn once more to the verses which form what may be called the *locus classicus* as to the oneness of the faith, and I find that it is associated indissolubly with the oneness of Baptism. Assuming, as we are justified in doing, that the formula of baptism which was used by the Apostle was, substantially at least, identical with that which the Lord gave to the Apostles when He bade them to go and teach the Gentiles, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, we can scarcely err in inferring that the confession of faith in that name was prominent in St. Paul's thoughts. That inference is raised to something like absolute certainty when we see that what he dwells on in connection with the one faith is that there is also one Spirit, one Lord (manifestly the Lord Jesus as the Son of God), one God and Father of all. The confession of that Divine Name in its trinal unity was accordingly all that was essential to the integrity of the one faith.

Is it too bold a conclusion from these premisses that the Church at large, and each national Church in particular, would have done wisely to have followed in this matter the guidance of St. Paul, to have been content to accept what he accepted, and to have seen in what was a sufficient faith to justify the admission of a catechumen to baptism, that which was sufficient also for his whole life as a member of the Church of Christ? It might be the duty of a Church to guard against error *in its teachers* by placing in their hands fuller and more elaborate statements of truths which had been distorted or denied, and requiring their assent to those statements as a condition of admission to the ministry; but if this were enough to qualify the believer for becoming a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven, was there not somewhat of presumption in labelling definitions, opinions, formulæ, as being equally *de fide*, uttering anathemas against those who denied them or preferred other formulæ, condemning, persecuting, slaying with fire or sword, as though doubt or denial were an iniquity to be punished by the judge? Is not this the lesson taught us by the experience of eighteen centuries? Is it not time for the Churches to issue forth from the tangled path of labyrinthine subtleties in which they have so long wandered, and to return to the simplicity of their first faith and of their earliest wisdom as well as to their first love? The intellect of men, that which Coleridge has called the logical understanding, asks many questions about God and the universe and men, and the beginning and the end of all things, some of which can scarcely be answered at all except by an "insane license of affirmation," all of which should be answered with the reverential humility which feels that its best eloquence is its silence, and that when we speak of things above our capacity and reach, our words should be wary and few. We know what such subtleties have issued in, the endless swarm of creeds in the fourth century, out of which the Nicene Confession emerges with a marvellous simplicity and beauty, the "vermiculate" questions of the *Sentences* of Lombard and the *Summa* of Aquinas, the dogmas of Trent and Augsburg, the *Institutes* of Calvin and the Westminster Confession. I fear I must add, as regards intention, though the results have been overruled for good, the Thirty-nine Articles and the pseudo-Athanasian Creed.

That last parenthesis requires, perhaps, a word of explanation. What I mean is this—(1) As regards the Articles it can hardly be questioned, I imagine, that it was the aim of the Bishops of the English Church in 1542 to show that they, too, like the Reformed and Lutheran Churches, had a dogmatic system of their own, which they were prepared to defend, as Jewell defended it in his *Apologia*, as being capable of proof from Scripture and in harmony with primitive tradition. They dealt mainly with what were then the burning questions of the day, the canon and the authority of Scripture, the various points of the controversy with Rome, the doctrines of justification and election. From the nature of the case, however, they had to steer their way cautiously and deftly between the views of contending parties, each of which was strong enough to hinder the complete triumph of its opponents. And so, within little more than half a century, in an authoritative document which, though issuing from the State, and so far Erastian in its character, the Church has practically adopted as her own by incorporating it in every edition of her Prayer-Book, it was, as regards the whole quinquarticular controversy, declared to be a matter of exultation that "even in the curious points" (we note the significant change of phrase in regard to what had been looked on as the *articuli stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*), "in which the present differences lie, men of all sorts take the Articles to be for them." Logical inferences from Scripture in "those unhappy differences, which have for so many hundred years, in different times and places, exercised the Church of Christ" were formally denounced, and men were to be "shut up" to the promises of God as they are generally set forth to us in the Holy Scriptures, and to the "general meaning" (that meaning itself being left undefined) of "the Articles of the Church of England according to those promises." Within another half-century it was discovered that they admitted of an equal latitude in regard to the other great controversy with which they dealt, and Davenport (better known perhaps as Francis à Sancta Clara) anticipated the argument of Newman's *Tract Ninety* in showing that the Articles, "though the offspring of an uncatholic age, were themselves not uncatholic," and might include, as they actually did include, before the political action of Elizabeth rendered the breach irreparable, those who held, on the whole, with the teaching of Trent rather than with that of the Swiss or Lutheral Reformers.

(2). In the case of the pseudo-Athanasian Creed there are, it must be admitted, no signs of wavering or compromise. The writer notes with a subtle skill the deviations from the Church's faith on the right hand and on the left, and fixes on each the brand of a soul-destroying heresy. He pushes every hazy error, floating in the mists of speculation, to some monstrous conclusion as its necessary outcome. He exults, as in the supreme master-stroke of his craft, in proving that the poor Sabellian, while he thinks that he is maintaining the unity of the Godhead, is really worshipping not one Person, but nine. But here also time has brought its corrective, and has blunted the edge that once seemed so pitiless and keen. Those who hold that it would have been wiser and happier for the Church to have been satisfied with the confessions of her baptismal formula, and her unvarying, or scarcely varying, doxologies and the Apostles' Creed, as the records of the historical groundwork of her life, can yet accept the dogmatic propositions of the Athanasian Creed as being, in their relation to the controversies out of which they grew, closer approximations to the truth than those which contradict them. And as for the so-called "damnatory clauses," though we may regret that they are still retained and used, being, as they are, a stumbling-block to the weak and ignorant, they have, as we all know, received again and again at the hands of representative divines—from Dr. Hey to Dr. Pusey—an explanation which robs them of their sting, and, exempting from their range every form of involuntary error, and invincible ignorance and insuperable prejudice, limits their application to that wilful denial of truth, known and accepted as truth, which is not heresy but dishonesty.

The development of men's thoughts, the enlargement of the range of scientific and critical inquiries, perhaps also a keener desire to find the ways of God in the mysteries of His government of the world, and the future history of mankind, not only "unsearchable and past finding out," but equal and righteous altogether, with a righteousness and a love beyond that which has been recognised in the narrowing systems of the past, have in our time brought a new crop of questions to the front. The nature and limits of inspiration, the authorship and date of the canonical books, the antiquity of the earth and man, the doctrine of evolution, the problems of eschatology, are the things with which we find ourselves face to face. And here, as before, there have been the scares and panics of a "little faith." Men have been impatient, and for precipitating things, and, as in the case of Williams, and Wilson, and Colenso, and Robertson Smith, have clamoured for decisive utterances which should remove this or that formula from the category of open questions into that of articles of faith. The attempt has not hitherto been successful, and is not likely to be so in the future. Formularies that have proved to be elastic in relation to the special questions with which they professed to deal, will scarcely be found rigidly unbending in their application to questions which were not even within the horizon of their framers. If I am right in the main positions I have endeavoured to maintain, it will be our wisdom to accept the situation not only as inevitable, but as fulfilling a purpose higher and wider than our own. The thoughts of men on these matters may well be left to take their place in that diversity of opinions which is compatible with, perhaps is the necessary complement of, unity in the faith, though it is excluded by a rigorous uniformity, in proportion to its logical completeness.

I do not know how far the terms of the question committed to me were intended to include diversities of opinion in regard to matters of practice, such as ritual, as well as in regard to matters of speculation. Theoretically, it may seem easy to draw a hard-and-fast line between them, but not, I take it, practically. For in the questions which now divide us into hostile camps, what we have to deal with is a diversity of opinions as to the meaning of a rubric, the importance of a symbol, the authority of a court. Can we say that that diversity is more perilous, more inconsistent with the unity of the faith, than the differences on the weightier matters of the law which have come before us, as prominent in the several stages of the Church's history? If time, and, it may be, other considerations lead me to touch lightly on this class of questions, it is not because I think they should be dealt with in a different spirit. The pleader for freedom in the region of thought does ill when he appears as the advocate of repression in that of worship. Unity, not uniformity, is our watchword there also. What we need is not the "red tape" of obsolete and ambiguous rubrics, but the "elastic bands" of a large and liberal tolerance.

And the signs of the time warn us that we shall do well to seek to maintain the unity of the faith, not in the strife of parties, but in the bond of peace. From the camp of the Liberation Society we have once and again the threatening echoes of the cry, in season and out of season, *Delenda est Carthago*. From the armies of secularism there come, often in multitudinous forms of blasphemy, cries that seem the very echo of the *Ecrasez l'infame* of Voltaire. Those who watch the gathering of the heavens warn us that we are on the eve of a conflict between light and darkness, good and evil, all that is Christian and all that is anti-Christian, to which the previous history of the world and of the Church presents no parallel. In presence of that peril it will be wise to minimise our differences, to welcome all auxiliaries who are one with us in the unity of the Apostolic faith, to be tolerant of many eccentricities, to show our sympathies with much with which yet we are unable to agree.

Is there not another sign of the times leading to the same conclusion, not without the promise of better things or the threatening of worse than it has yet presented to us, in that great movement which has spread among us till it presents a parallel at once to the mission work of Wesley and of Whitfield, and the claim of the early Friends to an inward illumination, and the organised autocracy of the Society of Jesus? If the Salvation Army has done nothing else it has at least shown that the capacity for what we call religion; for what is, perhaps, better defined as godliness—*godlikeness*—is not extinct even in the classes which we had almost given up as hopelessly beyond our reach. The consciousness of sin is there, and the craving for pardon and for peace, and the joy and peace in believing, and the yearning for a Father's love, and the felt communion with a Spirit higher than our own, and the love of souls which constrains each soldier of Christ to be also an evangelist, and the self-denial and self-mastery which leads men to cut off the right hand or pluck out the right eye, rather than that they should stumble themselves or make others stumble. And the preaching which works all this, what is it but the proclamation of the primal faith in its simplest and earliest form; the belief in the Father Who claims us as his children, in the Son Who has redeemed us and all mankind, in the Spirit Which sanctifies us and all the chosen ones of God. Forgetting, ignoring, perhaps ultimately rejecting, baptism, the Army bears its involuntary, unconscious testimony to the power of the truth involved in the threefold Baptismal Name. In the hallelujahs of its marches and its triumphs, we may hear the echoes of the doxologies of ancient days, which through the strife of tongues and the clash of sects have proclaimed the glory of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, for ever and for ever.

Canon FURSE followed, and said:—Belief and thought must first be considered in their relation to the idea of truth in the mind of God. If the knowledge of truth be an attribute of God, our knowledge must be brought into conformity with His, as our moral nature must conform with His. A revelation from God would be proportionate to His knowledge. The scale would vary, but the symmetry would be observed. Hence man dare not add or take away. Theology would not tolerate eclecticism. As every portion of revealed truth was designed to supply some human want, men lost the right development of their own character by omitting at their caprice portions of the creed. Doctrine was a form or type in which the character was to be moulded. If these limits were observed, within them we might use economy in the presentation of truth to other minds. That such accommodation was used by God was clear from the very structure of Scripture, and it was provided for all ages and diversities of thought by the living Mind of the Church. We must be extreme in fidelity and simplicity, as a good witness is extreme, and the man of science is extreme. In discussion men should strike the spring as high as they can reach, and find a point of contact with their opponents' original convictions. Points connected with the Sacraments and the ministry were not to be argued at the vanishing point. It was probable Dr. Pusey held a position nearer the heart of the Evangelical school, of whom he was so uncompromising an opponent, than did others of his ownparty, simply because he took every subject back to its spiritual spring, and his severity was only as a sphere of his love. Love was the great solvent of discord and the best safeguard of truth.

The Rev. R. B. GIRDLESTONE:—

The subject under discussion is abstract, almost vague. It implies that we belive the same things though we think differently about them. It is open to the objection that if our thoughts are different our beliefs can hardly be the same. It raises the question, Do our beliefs spring out of our thought, or our thought out of our beliefs? It may be said, however, that belief and thought occupy different spheres of our being, and that by belief we mean primary intuitions or convictions, whilst thoughts are slowly reached by processes of argumentation. Leaving others to discuss this, I must add that the subject needs to be circumscribed. Does it solely refer to differences of thought inside the Church of England? or does it include the great questions at issue between us and our Nonconforming brethren, and the still greater questions which lie between Christians and atheistic materialists? These subjects are really so connected that the principles applicable to one line of inquiry will help us in dealing with the others. One thing is clear: this subject of unity and diversity, which crops up so often at our Church Congresses, implies a yearning after a brotherly spirit among those who hold the same faith and use the same religious formularies, and it suggests the hope that there may be some further approximation attainable amongst those who are travelling along different lines of thought. The hope is a pleasant one. What hinders its realisation? I believe that the hindrance lies in the near presence of two foes with which we shall have to carry on determined warfare to the end of time. What those foes are we shall shortly see.

The Bible and the Prayer-Book agree in affirming that there are certain truths which Christ's ministers are to teach always and to all men. It is of the utmost importance that we should find out what these truths are; but when we have spent a lifetime on the task we shall probably grant that the Church of Christ is a great deal larger than the Church of England; that no party in the Church possesses a monopoly of truth or virtue; that Protestants may learn from Papists, Churchmen from Dissenters, Christians even from non-Christians. At the same time we all agree as to what a Christian really is. We hold him to be a disciple of *Christ*—not of *ourselves*; one who believes the Gospel narrative to be substantially true, and who in consequence of this belief has yielded himself to Christ as the Son of God, the Saviour of the world; receiving that which Christ was exalted to bestow, and doing that which Christ was empowered to command. Perhaps it may be also granted (though I am not sure) that the visible Church of Christ includes all who profess and call themselves Christians, and the invisible includes all who walk worthy of their profession. When, however, we go beyond the practical domain of Christian life into questions of criticism and of philosophy, diversities of thought make themselves manifest, though even here the foundations of the faith are agreed upon. No one who calls himself a Christian doubts the broad distinctions between right and wrong, or the truth that right is inseparable from God; or the fact that, human nature being what it is, man needs help over and above that which his natural faculties supply, in order that he may walk in the right path. Questions like these are closed, but others are open; and by "open" I do not mean doubtful, but worthy of fresh discussion in the light of fresh discoveries and increased or varied mental activity. For example, does Christianity involve uniformity of thought as to the mode of creation, or the time employed in the preparation of earth for man, or the universality of the deluge? No; these are matters of interpretation; neither from a Biblical, Catholic, nor Anglican point of view can they be regarded as closed. Again, is it lawful for a Christian to discuss the age and compilation of the books of the Old and New Testament? may he hold parly with one who believes in two Isaiahs, two Zechariahs, and many editors to the Pentateuch. I answer, these are questions of criticism which may be, nay must be, thoroughly and fairly faced. No one, for example, can attentively compare verse by verse parts of Samuel and Kings with parts of Chronicles without perceiving that in very ancient times there were differences of text in the Hebrew analogous with those with which we are all familiar in the New Testament. I will add my conviction that the more thoroughly these and cognate matters are gone into, the more intelligent will become our faith and the better able shall we be to hold and defend the real Christian position. One of the most interesting arguments for the antiquity of the Gospels is drawn from the character of the textual differences in the oldest MSS. and quotations, and I believe that an argument of an exactly similar character may be drawn with respect to parts of the Old Testament from the materials lying hidden in our Hebrew Bibles. All that is needed is that we should face these critical questions with patience and candour, and lightly be moved from our settled convictions, because a man quotes German or has the word "Professor" prefixed to his name. But we must draw the line somewhere. Supposing that in yielding to the stream of "higher criticism" we drift away from Christ. Nothing is more clear than this, that any attempt to undermine the substantial accuracy of the Old Testament reflects on the New Testament. Christianity will be dissolved if the Old Testament be cut adrift. Yes, but Christianity cannot be dissolved. It stands on imperishable grounds—the grounds of history and experience, backed up by the voice of reason and conscience. The consequence is that there will always be a certain point at which we turn upon the critic and say, "Hitherto shalt thou go and no further, and here shall thy proud waves be stayed." There is a considerable element of uncertainty in the speculations of higher criticism, owing to the paucity of its materials; and the conclusions of to-day may be thrown aside by the discoveries of to-morrow. Meanwhile, Christ is the same, and there is no uncertainty in Him; and we must never give up what is vital and sure at the call of what is, at the best, only hypothetical and unsubstantial.

We pass to another kind of question which gives rise to diversity of thought. Things physical and things spiritual are so entwined, at least in the mode in which they are presented to man, that we do not all draw the boundary line between God and Nature at the same place. The analyst of physical phenomena goes backwards and forwards through nature and finds not God. It is not that nature is to him a substitute for God, but owing to the ingenuity of his mind he assigns to the molecules and atoms of matter those attributes which are really immaterial, and so project upon things visible the properties of the invisible God. The very fact that he searches into the hidden causes of things is something; it links him with the Author of the universe; the physical leads him, whether he will or not, to the metaphysical; and metaphysics is another word for theology. What foundation of belief shall we rest upon if we desire to minimise our philosophical, scientific, or metaphysical diversities of thought? I answer, it is vain to turn at such a time to the so-called Athanasian Creed, which presents in a crystallised form those truths which the Scripture gives in their natural relations, we must rather take our stand on human nature, on its facts, its possibilities, its history, its aspirations, and on our own personal experience. These, at any rate, present a common ground; and the mysteries which these involve are inscrutable, except in the light of Christianity. Things Divine and metaphysical are brought near to things human and physical in the man Christ Jesus. Who that studies the Gospels with a receptive heart can doubt any longer that there is One above man who takes an abiding self-sacrificing interest in man?

But some will go thus far and refuse to go further, because they see no disruption in the course of nature before their eyes such as they read of in Scripture. Are they to be excommunicated, or is there a more excellent way? The candid narrator of our Lord's appearance after his Resurrection, says that "some doubted," and some will always remain overburdened by the almost insurmountable difficulties which present themselves to the mind of the physical philosopher. He reasons with himself; he tells himself that there are analogies in nature, and especially human nature, answering to the mighty works of Christ; he acknowledges that there was a fitness in miracles of healing and resurrection as an accompaniment to the great work of redeeming love; yet the old enemy haunts him. The true remedy is to fall back upon the spiritual, moral, and experimental side of Christianity—to study, to pray, to practise; and it will be strange if the student engaged in such a course does not receive a visit from the Angel of the Covenant, the Great Shepherd of the sheep, who will overmaster in him the influence of things seen. This mastery of Christ over the soul is salvation. When He is felt to be supreme, things which at other times seem hard to be believed are seen in their true light, and the peace of God rules in the heart.

I come, unwillingly, to another branch of the subject. The Church of England is on a large basis. Instead of spending our strength in attempting to narrow it we shall be better employed in using our liberty to preach the everlasting Gospel of Christ, and to fight under His banner in that way which seems most in accordance with His word and most adapted for the times in which we live. We all acknowledge that there is a right and a wrong, a true and an untrue, in history, in doctrine, in life. It may be granted, indeed, that Christians may live in a measure as Christ lived, under the shadow of teaching which is in some respects contrary to sound doctrine. But we cannot allow ourselves to be beguiled into a spirit of indifference on controverted points, especially when we remember our ordination vows. I agree with a letter written by a celebrated lady to an ecclesiastic, whose voice you have already heard this afternoon, part of which runs as follows:—"Mrs. Booth is utterly at a loss to understand, especially in responsible teachers of religion, that indifference, as it seems to her, on great questions of truth which is so popular nowadays, and which can embrace, with equal friendship men who worship a Christ said to be materially present on the altar, and men who deny Divine worship to the Christ altogether. She prefers to be thought a narrow-minded bigot for adhering to the old-fashioned teachings of the Church as she has always understood them, and condemning as false whatever is not true according to the word of God." Two things must be borne in mind, first, that diversities of thought on doctrine and ceremony date back to the time of the Apostles; and, secondly, that men attain their views on these subjects not through external compulsion, nor by deliberate choice; rather they are drawn along by a series of mental and spiritual influences over some of which they have had no control. We do not adopt opinions differing from those of our brethren for mere variety's sake. The love of God's truth is often really at the bottom of them; were it not so Christianity would long ago have crumbled into dust. A man once said to me, How is it that you Christians quarrel so desperately over your religion? I might have answered that religion is not the only thing over which men quarrel—that there is an *odium philosophicum*, and an *odium politicum*, even an *odium medicum*, as well as an *odium theologicum*. But I replied, that we fight most earnestly about those things which appear to us most vital, and that the details of vestment and ritual over which some men contend are regarded by them as outworks of the fortress of truth, and as symbols of vital doctrine. I freely admit that our ritual controversies produce infinite mischief, and that the time spent in controversy would be far better employed in studying the remedies for infidelity, crime, drunkenness, poverty, overcrowding, and other evils which are at our doors; but I see no way out of our present position. Not that we need all take part in the fray. Some of us love our independence; we shrink from acting with others for what are called party purposes; we consider each question as far as possible on its own merits, and are willing to submit in minor details to the wisdom of the responsible heads of the Church. But with all our desire to avoid controversy we cannot shut our eyes to Scripture and to history; we cannot, for example, get over our repugnance to Romanism and to everything suggestive of it. We believe that the religion of Christ as set forth in Scripture, and as illustrated by the oldest Christian records, is one thing, and that the religion of the modern Romish Church is another. We not only shrink from the doctrines of Rome, which we believe to be dishonouring to Christ and opposed to the welfare of the individual and of society, but we refuse to take a step in a Romeward direction even though that step be harmless in itself. The word "mediæval" has no charm for us; and we have learnt to distinguish between what is ancient and what is primitive, between the fathers and the grandfathers. Moreover we feel that we have our duty to the laity, and that the greater the liberty which ecclesiastical lawyers allow us, so much the greater is our responsibility to be loyal to "God's word written."

Many of our controversies arise from a vague use of words, such as regenerate, real, spiritual, objective, sacrifice, priest, mystery, catholic, conversion. To take an instance, What does the word "Churchman" mean? Sometimes it implies only that a man is a member of the Church of England; but at other times it implies that a man holds so-called "Church doctrines." Let anyone examine the Biblical usage of the word "Church," and its Hebrew and Greek equivalents, and then let him use. Again, an incumbent in one of our manufacturing towns is lately reported to have said that in the Lord's Supper "the bread and wine *become* really and truly the body and blood of the Lord and Saviour." Let those who approve of this saying weigh well the difference between the verbs to *be* and to *become* in Hebrew and Greek.

What we really need is a school of thorough Biblical students who not only know the English language, but also labour and pray over their Hebrew and Greek Bibles, reverently weighing all that God has spoken.

Whatever are the merits or demerits of the Revised English New Testament, at any rate it has led many to re-examine certain familiar theological expressions, and this re-examination must, we suppose, tend to do away with some of our diversities of thought.

There are times, perhaps, as we stand at the death-bed of one we love, or at the open grave of a leader in theology, when we feel that formularies and rites—even language itself—cannot adequately express our beliefs and our thoughts. We push them aside and gaze into a wide all-embracing reality. But we are speedily if not rudely brought back from a vague groping after things as they are, to the more sober contemplation of things as they seem. Yet we are wiser for the dim vision which has been vouchsafed to us; it has taught us to look upon human opinions—even in our own—with new charity, and to regard Church dogmas as suggestive guides and guards rather than as exact counterparts of absolute truth.

There are some practical questions in which, with all our hatred of partisanship, we are almost driven to take sides. A politician has at times to give up his independence, and to vote; a mother must send for an allopath or homœopath for her sick child; we have to elect proctors for Convocation; we must decide how much to subscribe to the S.P.G., and how much to the C.M.S.; and we must make up our minds between the *Record* and the *Guardian*, unless we have the courage to read both or neither.

As for other matters, in spite of all the good advice offered at Church Congresses, some of us will continue to reject a rite because it is Romish, or to adopt it because it is mediæval; to object to the word priest as savouring of sacerdotalism, or to stick to it as implying the supposed advantage of human intervention between the soul and the Saviour. To one the sacrificial side of Christ's work will be everything, to another its moral and spiritual aspects will be all-important. One will attribute inspiration to Scripture in a special sense, another will find the inspiring spirit everywhere, and a third nowhere. One will regard Sunday as an ecclesiastical ordinance, another as a social convenience, a third as a survival of the Sabbatic law given to man in Paradise. We shall continue to differ in our ideas as to the way of pardon, the nature of sanctification and justification, and the method of Sacramental grace; but we shall continue to agree as to the character of Christ, the supreme value of His atoning death, the reality of power from on high, the ideal of a Christian life; and this being so, whilst firmly contending for what we believe to be true all the way round, we need not bite and devour one another.

To conclude: The two forces which keep us in a state of ferment and division are—first, the attempt to do without Divine revelation and grace. This is finding its culmination in atheistic materialism, and it is by far our most terrible enemy. Secondly, the attempt to substitute human organisations for the direct working of Christ's Spirit. This enemy is less destructive, but more attractive. It is a determined adversary to our Church and to our social system, and its headquarters are in the Vatican. These are the Scylla and Charybdis between which we have to steer! they play into one another's hands, and their potency lies in the fact that we all carry the rudiments of them in our own bosoms.

The way to stand against these powers of the evil One and to progress in spite of them is the old way—viz., living to Christ through the indwelling of His Spirit, and in conformity with His word, or, as the Prayer-Book has it, "in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life." For, after all, to use the lately published words of Mr. Gladstone, "Christianity is Christ, and nearness to Him and to His image is the end of all your efforts."

The Rev. R. T. DAVIDSON:—

The paper—eminently thoughtful and instructive, and therefore eminently characteristic—with which the Dean of Wells opened this discussion steered us out into the open sea of this very wide subject, with a boldness which is the legitimate outcome of his abundant learning and his long success. The papers which followed have added to the sense of incompetence with which I rise to speak. A steersman so far inferior as I am to any of the three must be content to keep to humbler waters near the shore. May I first say just one word about the choice of this subject for discussion? In one form or another it has been discussed, I think, at every Church Congress on record, and people may say—they do say—I have heard it myself—"We have had enough of this subject; everything that can be said about it has been said long ago!" Now, even if this cry were true, which I don't admit, I should still say we were right to put the subject in the forefront, and to say over again all that has been said before. There are some truths—those, for example, which deal with the individual soul's relation to its God—which, as it seems to me, are apt to suffer from the very process of free discussion in public. There are others, and this subject is emphatically one of them, which are strengthened every time you bring them forward. The stamp of reality is once more impressed upon our unity of faith every time the fact is emphasised in an assembly such as this. Therefore I rejoice that we are once more called upon to-day to give expression to the mighty truth that, under all our surface differences, we are essentially one at heart. It is sometimes the fashion nowadays to ascribe the keenness of our party spirit to the rancour engendered by some of the "religious newspapers" of the day. I don't believe a word of it. It is giving them far too much importance. God forbid that I should stand here for an instant to defend the venom and the pettiness which every week disgrace the party newspapers, which live by the very quarrels we deplore; but, with all their badness and their spite, I believe they are the result and not the cause of our party spirit. It existed in full force long before the *Rock* or the *Church Times* were born. Cheap printing and halfpenny postage make it easy, of course, for a scattered party with only a few score representatives here and there in England to present what looks like a united front with a phalanx of strength behind. You can, by these papers, pull your wires and tighten your organisation as you could not do in any other way. But, I repeat it, the papers are the natural expression and not the origin of our party spirit. What are the facts? In this year of grace, 1882, there are about 2,000 different newspapers published every week in the United Kingdom. Every sort of human craze and crotchet, good, bad, and indifferent, has its own organ. Anti-vaccination reformers, women's suffrage reformers, and every separate grade and sort of temperance reformers: each of these and twenty more have a newspaper of their own, and when you find on looking down the list that there is a *Mineral Waters Advocate* and a *Hairdressers' Chronicle*, it need not surprise you that the ecclesiastical world should, besides its great newspapers, have its petty organs too. Of this I am quite sure—if it had been possible to have a *Church Times* and a *Rock* in easy circulation in the last century, say when Sacheverell was impeached before the House of Lords, or when Toplady attacked John Wesley, or when Lord George Gordon cried "No Popery," we should have had words upon both sides at least as vehement as any that are likely to appear in print about our doings and sayings to-day. There are always some men who revel in party controversy—

When sharp and stinging
The angry words fly daily to and fro,
Friend against friend the polished missile flinging,
Each seeking who can launch the keenest blow.

There have always been, and there always will be, vigorous, hearty shillelagh-loving men, rushing headlong into the thickest fray with the honest Irishman's exclamation, as he hit out right and left, "God grant I may take the right side!" It is not that party spirit runs higher now, but only that it is easier to give it voice. The more duty then for us to give full voice upon the other side to the indisputable truth that, after all, we are still one at heart. How are we to do it? It is, perhaps, easy enough upon this platform once a year, but how are we to do it as the year goes round? May I, with every sort of apology for the presumption, suggest one or two ways in which we may bring to the front this "unity of belief, in relation to diversities of thought?" First then, I venture to think we ought sometimes, at our desks if not elsewhere, to clear the air for a little from technical theological terms, and by reducing the questions about which we are apt to be controversial to the simplest and most untechnical English we can find, see whether we are not, after all, more at one than we suppose. I am a shocking mathematician, but I do remember in Colenso's Arithmetic a certain rule—"Reduce your fractions to their lowest terms." "Thirty-two forty-eights" sounds ever so much more imposing than "two-thirds," but it means the same thing, and is not half such a satisfactory term to deal with. And so when I am distressed by the Popery of one friend or the Puritanism of another, it would do me all the good in the world if I would sit down quietly and reduce the statements which vex us into simple English, avoiding every sort of technical or theological word. I should probably find the "greatest common measure" of the rival statements to be very much bigger than I had thought. It is so surely (to take one example) with our old controversies about confession. What is "confession?" Probably few of us would fully agree in a detailed definition of its authority, its origin, its system, and its use, but we should all go so far as to say it is the unburdening of one man's heart to another man specially accredited to hear and advise, and officially to declare God's pardon of repented sin. Well, the "common measure" there, which belongs to all our definitions, is pretty large. We go a long way together before we are obliged to separate; and that just because we are avoiding theological technicalities. Had we begun with these we should have split at once. And we might apply the same process to other theological battle-grounds with the same or even better effect. "Baptismal regeneration," "sacramental grace," and many another controverted term would resolve itself into a far less formidable shape if we could strip it of the long words which usually envelop it. Of course I don't for one moment say that these long words are never necessary, or that the technical definitions are always out of place. But I do say that most of us, who are not called upon to do the work either of Athanasius or of Cranmer, can get on very well without them, and that, in common life at least, we should do very much better if we were habitually to reduce our fractions to their lowest terms by discovering their greatest common measure. I should have liked to point out in the next place, had I time, the mischief we are doing sometimes by persistently attributing to each good man who may differ from us, not merely the opinions he really expresses, but what seem to us to be the legitimate and logical conclusions of those opinions. This is the process—I take his premisses, then I draw from them my own conclusion, and then I maintain that he holds that conclusion as an article of faith. Probably he does nothing of the kind. He may very likely be illogical; but then, so may I. Where controversy must be carried on, it is all very well to show a man quietly what is the issue to which his errors, as I think them, must logically carry him. But that is quite another matter from jumping the intervening steps, and exclaiming against my friend for the monstrous opinion he holds, when, as a matter of fact, he doesn't hold it any more than I do. The bell will be upon me if try to amplify this. But one simple example will show what I mean. The strict doctrine of the absolute necessity of the Apostolical succession for valid orders, and the absolute necessity of valid orders for sacramental grace, may seem to some of us to lead to this—that the Established Church of Scotland, or our Dissenting brethren in England, are in at least as bad a plight as the untaught heathen of Patagonia or Coomassie. But my High Church brother doesn't hold such an opinion any more than I do; and I have no right to say he does, merely because his arguments seem to me to lead him in that direction. He may be a very illogical person, and I am quite at liberty, if I can, to show him so. But I am not at liberty falsely to magnify and multiply our divergencies by imputing to him notions which he repudiates and denies. We may find some day—God grant it—when our eyes are opened, that we did not disagree half so much as we supposed, and that a very great many of us are better than our creeds. Now I have come to my last point. It is this. It is not only in theory, but in practice, that we have so much common ground. It is ground for action as well as thought. Look at the sermons of the best men of any school. How little comparatively there is in any one of them which would ticket it as belonging to one party or another. They have the same message to tell, and they tell it. Within the last few days I have read an old sermon of Dr. Pusey's which might equally well have been preached by Charles Simeon. It would be easy to find fifty others of a like sort. Let a man (perhaps under present circumstances he had better be a blind man) go on six successive Sundays to the churches of half a dozen of our foremost London preachers. I am quite certain—and I thank God for it—he would fail to put the proper party labels upon the men he listened to. And yet some of us are fearful of letting into our pulpits to preach the common Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ men who on some ecclesiastical point or other, which they are not going to preach about, differ from ourselves. Not long ago I asked a worthy friend of mine, whose sermons are very popular, and whose opinions are very Protestant indeed, whether he had ever invited to his pulpit a neighbouring clergyman, well known as a Mission preacher and something of a Ritualist. "My dear Davidson," he cried, "I wouldn't do it for the world, and besides, my people would stone me if I did." And yet I venture to say without fear that if each of these good men were to print and circulate anonymously one of his own ordinary sermons together with one of his neighbour's, five people out of six would fail to tell which was which. It was only now and then, after all, that the things about which we differ come to the front in a good man's sermons, and you may be certain he won't take the opportunity of thrusting them forward when he is asked to preach for one who looks upon them differently from himself. Nothing, I honestly believe, would better stamp the unity of faith and worship which underlies our petty differences than a freer and franker interchange of pulpits. If here and there a conceivable risk might be run, and the congregation of some staunch upholder of Protestant freedom or of Catholic order might for once hear something to which they were unaccustomed, the gain overbalances the risk a thousandfold. Pick out any six of us parsons from this platform. Judge us by our hats or our waistcoats, or what you please. Set us down upon a battle-field when the fight is over, to minister to the dying. Bring us face to face with men who are passing from time into eternity, and I will answer for it that in five minutes our party badges would be nowhere and our message would be one. The territory common to us all outmeasures a thousandfold in size and importance the debatable ground of party strifes. What are the two books which next to our Bible and Prayer-Book have the widest circulation in English Christendom? They are the work of a Puritan tinker and an Anglo-Catholic Divine—the *Pilgrim's Progress* and the *Christian Year*. Evidence enough, one would think, that even in our widest diversities we have no lack of common ground. Recognise it then, and look for it. As St. Augustine says, "Quisquis bonus verusque Christianus est, Domini sui esse intelligat ubique invenerit veritatem." Let us pray together for our mother Church, which has weathered many storms and will weather more—

> That her fair form may stand and shine,
>   Make bright our days, and light our dreams,
> Turning to scorn with lips Divine
>   The falsehood of extremes."

The Bishop of **WINCHESTER** said he agreed with the last speaker from the bottom of his heart that they might consider a few practical questions as to how greater unity might be obtained without any sacrifice of vital truth, and with perfect friendliness one towards another. There was no Christian but must feel that their great diversities of thought and organisation were rending asunder the body of Christ and producing much harm. Was there any simple way in which this might be remedied? If they were to have unity they must build upon a basis of dogma. It was impossible for them to have unity of action as Christians unless they believed in the unity and personality of God. That was dogma of a very strong kind. It was dogma, too, to believe in the Incarnation of Christ, and that He died for our sins, and it was also dogma to believe in the Holy Spirit as the giver of life to the soul. These were dogmas they could not do without, and upon which they must build. But they need not have a great variety of dogma. The Nicene Creed seemed to him to state in the most distinct, clear, and not uncharitable form the fundamental doctrines of the faith, and with these as the basis of their faith it seemed to him that every other doctrine might be tolerated. He held with neither the extreme High Church nor the extreme Low Church party, but he could unite with both. It was also absolutely necessary that they should have an organisation. No army could fight without an organisation. If they had unity on the basis of the Nicene Creed, and upon the organisation of the primitive Church, they might then tolerate almost any diversity, either of faith or of practice, without quarrelling and fighting. (Cheers.) The only objection he found to any of his friends, whether High Churchmen, Low Churchmen, Nonconformists, or Roman Catholics, was, not that they held opinions with which he could not agree, but that they insisted upon his holding them also. (Laughter.)

Bishop **PERRY** said diversity of thought implied error of doctrine, which was fatal to unity of belief, and, therefore, there was need to discriminate in regard to differences of thought and their relative importance. A Christian man might unconsciously lead others astray. There were two schools of thought, and their views were irreconcilable. There was a middle party seeking peace, but it would be a peace at the expense of truth. He desired unity, but did not wish to purchase it by overlooking fundamental differences.

The Rev. C. **LLOYD ENGSTROM**, Secretary of the Christian Evidence Society, asked what was faith, and said it was the aspiration of all men's higher nature to God. But man was composed of heart, will, and mind. A man might believe with heart and will, and yet not see his way to giving mental assent because of the caricature of Christ we give by narrow doctrine and inconsistent conduct.

After remarks by the Rev. R. **RANDALL** and the Rev. W. **GEDGE**, the discussion was closed.

At the evening meeting the first paper was read by the Bishop of **LIVERPOOL**:—

NEGLECT OF PUBLIC WORSHIP.

It is a great fact which, I fear, admits of no dispute, that the working classes of England, as a body, are "conspicuously absent" from the public worship of God on Sundays. Census after census in our large towns has lately brought this painful fact before the public mind. My own eyes continually see proofs of it, when I preach in some quarters of Liverpool. I often see things which make my heart bleed. After making every allowance for defective, unfair, and unfriendly enumerations, there remains a mass of evidence which cannot be gainsaid. A vast number of English working men never go either to church or chapel, and, to all appearance, live end die "without God."

This state of things, we must all feel, is eminently unsatisfactory, and deserves the best attention of a Congress. But it is much more than unsatisfactory. It endangers the very existence of the Established Church of England. We cannot do without "the masses." The Church whose adherents are a minority in the land will not be long allowed to retain her endowments and her connection with the State in this age. A regiment consisting only of officers and band, without rank and file, adds nothing to the strength of an army. A Church which can only number the rich among its members, and is deserted by the poor, is in a most unhealthy condition, and not like a servant of her Divine Master, whom "the common people heard gladly." I repeat that we are in front of a dangerous and unsatisfactory state of things. It is high time to search our ways, and try to "set our house in order," if we would not die, but live.

The subject is wide, and my time is short. I shall simply try to clear away three common delusions, and to point out two remedial things which, in my humble opinion, are much wanted in this day, and, by God's blessing, might change our position. As Napoleon said at Marengo, "It is not too late to win the battle."

(*a*) For one thing, then, I do not believe that the absence of working men from public worship arises from the spread of systematic infidelity among them. I know that this is an opinion held by many; but I take leave to call it a delusion. My own impression is decided, that even among the rudest and roughest ranks of society there is often a deep-seated vein of sturdy faith in a God and a world to come. No doubt there is a large quantity of most offensive infidel literature such as the *Freethinker*, which is exclusively circulated among the poorer classes, and is far too coarsely flavoured to suit the taste of the upper ten thousand. But of reasoning argumentative scepticism, there is just as much among the rich as among the poor. At this very moment, I shrewdly suspect, there are more agnostics and sceptics, in proportion to the population, in the West end of London than in the East. Nor is this all. The Tower Hamlets unbeliever is often a more honest man than his rich brother in Belgravia. Erring as he is, he has the courage of his opinions, and never goes to church at all. The rich sceptic, on the contrary, will often attend religious services for respectability's sake, or by way of example to his servants, while in reality he dispises the whole thing in his heart.

(*b*) For another thing, I believe it is a complete delusion to suppose that the working classes in England have any inherent dislike to the Established Church, and, if left to themselves, prefer the Dissenting Chapel. I believe nothing of the kind. I grant that our poorer brethren are very apt to judge the Church by the parson, and if he is not a satisfactory "persona ecclesiæ," to take a dislike to the body which he represents. If, for instance, he is a thoroughly worldly man, "a Nimrod, a ramrod, or a fishing-rod," who neither does his duty as a preacher or a pastor—or, if he is one who in his zeal for ceremonial, does things which they think are Romanism—it is very likely they will forsake the church, and stay at home, or go to chapel. But whenever the Church is properly represented, both in the pulpit and the parish, I maintain that, as a general rule, the working men will stick to her, and prefer her ministrations to any other. They like her Prayer-Book, her orders, and her general system, and will stand by her to the last.

(*c*) Once more, but not least, I regard it as a rank delusion to imagine that Christianity is an effete and worn-out system, that the old Gospel has lost its power, and that the nineteenth century requires a new religion. This is a sadly common idea in certain quarters. Men of intellect, as they are called, sneer contemptuously at such grand old verities as the atonement, the inspiration of the Bible, the reality of miracles, the need of grace, the personality of Satan, the judgment to come. They coolly tell us that these things will never move the working classes in this day, and that they will not come to church unless we give them a broader, more rational theology, stripped of everything supernatural. I do not admit this for a moment. I believe it to be empty talk and baseless assertion. I fail to see the slightest evidence that the old religion, which turned the world upside down eighteen centuries ago, has lost any of its power. I can discover no new system of teaching which regenerates heathen tribes, relieves burdened consciences, binds up broken hearts, checks sin, changes characters, deprives death of its terrors, compared to the old-fashioned Gospel of Christ. If there is such a new system, let men show it to us, and show us its fruits. The working classes, I am convinced, are not to be won to the Church by modern wind-bags and fireworks, but by the old story of the Cross.

But, after all, what *positive* suggestions can be made in order to meet the evil which we deplore? What is it that is wanting in the present day, which would be likely to draw the working classes into our churches, if we could supply it? I will briefly name two things which, in my judgment, are secrets of strength, and commend them to your consideration.

(*a*) For one thing, we want a great deal more *direct lively preaching of the Gospel* in all our pulpits, whether in the full liturgical service of the Church, or the simpler elementary service of the Mission Room.

In saying this, I would not be mistaken. I ask you to remark that I lay stress most emphatically on the words "direct" and "lively." That the distinctive doctrines of the Gospel are far more frequently found in the sermons of this day than they were in the sermons of last century, I have no doubt whatever. The wretched moral essays which our forefathers often heard, and which brought out the bitter remark that the clergy were only "apes of Epictetus," are no longer tolerated, and I trust will never return. But still, I must express a suspicion that the distinctive doctrines of the Gospel are often placed before the working classes in such an unattractive way that they will not listen, and will rather stay at home. It is vain to deny that when Christ's Gospel has been preached by such men as Whitfield, and Wesley, and Venn, and Grimshaw, in days past,—or by Spurgeon, or Guthrie, or Moody, or Aitken, or even by General Booth, in our own age,—there was, and is, little difficulty in getting working men to hear them. Where is the defect, then? What is it that is wanting? I fear there is only one simple answer. Our clergymen, as a body, do not pay sufficient attention to the *way of putting things*. They forget that it is not enough to have good tools, if they no not handle those tools in the right way. Will any one tell me that Whitfield, last century, or Moody, in our own time, would ever have assembled myriads of working men, if they had only read cold, tame, orthodox, theological essays couched in the first person plural number, full of "we" and "we," and destitute of warmth, vivacity, direct appeal, or fire? I will never believe it. But surely, if their style of address arrests and attracts the working classes, it seems a thousand pities that it is not more generally adopted. It is perfectly amazing to me that at this late period of the world men should need to be told, what Greeks and Romans knew well, that it is not the speaker's thoughts only which arrest the attention of hearers, but the style and manner in which those thoughts are conveyed.

I hear people complain, sometimes, that Mission Services produces no lasting effect, and too often the complaint is just and well-founded. Yet the explanation, in many cases, is simple and easy. A Mission preacher comes into a parish and addresses the people, with "thoughts that breathe and words that burn." He brings no new doctrine. He tells them nothing that they have not heard before. But he tells his story with such vivacity, and fire, and personal application, that he rouses the whole parish, and makes all classes want to hear him. The church is filled. The incumbent is delighted. The old clerk and sexton keep awake. The empty benches are all occupied. The whole place seems stirred.—And then what happens, far, far too often? The Mission preacher goes away, and the fire cools down. The innocent, well-meaning incumbent returns to his old style of preaching and gets into his old groove, and in two months undoes the missioner's work, and empties the church again. And all this is because he will not see that fiery liveliness and directness of style are one grand secret of pulpit success. For my part I heartily wish that clergymen who invite missioners to address their people would remember, that if they would keep up the missioner's work, they must preach in his style. After all, it would be a great gain to the Establishment if a huge bonfire were made, and myriads of essay-style sermons were burned.

I cannot, however, leave this part of my subject without adding the expression of my firm conviction, that there is *far less preaching of the whole Gospel* than there ought to be. When I say that, I mean that there is not enough made of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and His office and work, for our souls. This platform, of course, is no place for sermonising. But I must say that we are all apt to forget that it is quite possible to make an orthodox statement of doctrine, and yet not to *present Christ* to our hearers in the manner and proportion in which He is presented to us in the New Testament. I am struck with the undeniable fact that all preachers who succeed in getting hold of the working classes—whether Whitfield, or Moody, or any other—give a very marked prominence in their sermons to the atoning death, the ever-living intercession, the boundless mercy, the almighty power to save of that blessed Person in whose name we meet to-day. You have only to read reports of their preaching in order to see proof of what I say. And I will not hesitate to declare before this Congress my firm belief, that if we would get hold of the working classes, we must make "Christ crucified and risen again" far more the sun of our homiletic system than we have done in the Church of England. This is the lever which shook the world eighteen centuries ago, and is able to shake it now. It is a great magnet which in every age, from the Apostles downwards, has drawn men whom nothing else could draw. And it is a magnet, I am convinced, which has lost none of its attractive influence. I needly hardly say that it would be easy to enlarge on this point, if time permitted. But I cannot leave it without quoting the words of a mighty layman, which deserve attention—a layman of great experience and observation—a layman who in his time has taken great interest in religious questions. The layman I mean is the present Prime Minister of England—Mr. Gladstone. He said on the 22nd March, 1877, "It is the preaching of Christ our Lord which is the secret, and substance, and centre, and heart of all preaching; not merely of facts about Him, and notions about Him, but of His person, His work, His character, His simple yet unfathomable sayings,—here lies the secret." (*Times*, March 23rd.) That witness is true. Mr. Gladstone never said a truer thing in his life. The sermon full of Christ is the sermon which the Holy Spirit most usually blesses.

(*b*) The other suggestion which I venture to make, in order to solve the problem before us, is one which I hold to be of vast importance.

I say, then, that if we want to bring the working classes to church, *there needs, throughout the land, a great increase of sympathy and friendly personal dealing with them on the part of the clergy*.

I confess that I have immense faith in the power of sympathy and kindness. I believe the late Judge Talfourd hit the nail right on the head when he said, in almost his last charge to a Grand Jury, at Stafford Assizes:—"Gentlemen, the great want of the age is more sympathy between classes." I entirely agree with him. I think an increase of sympathy and fellow-feeling between high and low, rich and poor, employer and employed, parson and people, is one healing medicine which the age demands. Sympathy, exhibited in its perfection, was one secondary cause of the acceptance which Christ's Gospel met with on its first appearance in the heathen world. Well says Lord Macaulay,—"It was before Deity taking a human form, walking among men, partaking of their infirmities, leaning on their bosoms, weeping over their graves, slumbering in the manger, bleeding on the Cross, that the prejudices of the synagogue, and the doubts of the academy, and the fasces of the lictor, and the swords of thirty legions were humbled in the dust."—And sympathy, I firmly believe, can do as much in the nineteen century as it did in the first. If anything will melt down the cold isolation of classes in these latter days, and make our social body consist of solid cubes compacted together, instead of spheres only touching each other at one point, it will be a large growth of Christlike sympathy.

Now I assert confidently that the English working man is peculiarly open to sympathy, and the clergyman has peculiar opportunities of showing it. The working man may live in a poor dwelling; and after toiling all day in a coal-pit, or cotton mill, or iron foundry, or dock, or chemical works, he may often look very rough and dirty. But after all he is flesh and blood like ourselves. Beneath his outward roughness he has a heart and a conscience, a keen sense of justice, and a jealous recollection of his rights, as a man and a Briton. He does not want to be patronised and flattered any more than to be trampled on, scolded, or neglected; but he does like to be dealt with as a brother, in a friendly, kind, and sympathising way. He will not be driven; he will do nothing for a cold, hard man, however clever he may be. But give him a clergyman, who really understands that it is the heart and not the coat which makes the man, and that the guinea's worth is in the gold, and not in the stamp upon it—a clergyman who will not only preach Christ in the pulpit, but come and sit down in his house, and take him by the hand in a Christlike, familiar way during the week—a clergyman who realises that in Christ's holy religion there is no respect of persons, that rich and poor are "made of one blood," and needed one and the same atoning blood, and that there is only one Saviour, and one Fountain for sin, and one heaven, both for employers and employed—a clergyman who can weep with them that weep, and rejoice with them that rejoice, and feel a tender interest in the cares, and troubles, and births, and marriages, and deaths of the humblest dweller in his parish—give the working man a clergyman of that kind, and, as a general rule, the working man will come to his church.

I invite the special attention of my clerical brethren to this point. We live in days when public work of all kinds seems every year to absorb more of a clergyman's time. Committees, Bible-classes, lectures, meetings, frequent services, are rapidly increasing so much that they seem to leave ministers no time for house-to-house work, family work, and winning the confidence of individual souls. I warm them to be on their guard. All the public work in the world, however good, will not compensate for the loss of opportunities for cultivating relations of sympathy between yourselves and your people. Make time for going among them, sitting down with them, holding friendly converse with them, and in the long run you will find no time so well bestowed.

I am not speaking theoretically only. I have seen proof upon proof that I have warrant for what I say, both in colliery districts and in towns. I will give one, and so conclude my paper.

I know at this moment a parish of 4,500 people in Liverpool with not a rich man in it; but only small shopkeepers, artisans, and poor. There are only thirty families in it who keep a servant, and not one family which keeps two. There are 195 houses with more than one family in each. There are 133 families living in cellars. Many of these cellars are within a few yards from the church, and under its shadow. In short, this is a thoroughly poor, working-class parish, I think no one can deny.

Now, what does the Church of England do in this parish? Listen, and I will tell you.

In a plain brick church, holding 1,000, built thirteen years ago, there is a simple, hearty service, and an average attendance of 700 on Sunday morning, 300 in the afternoon, and 950 in the evening. About half the sittings are rented and half free. In three mission rooms there is an average attendance of about 350 in the morning, and 450 in the evening.

The total number of communicants is over 800, almost all of the working classes, and nearly half men. I myself helped once to administer the consecrated elements to 395, and I saw the hands which received them, and I know by those hands that many of them were dock labourers and foundry men.

The worthy minister of this parish began his work alone about fourteen years ago, with four people in a cellar. He has seen a church built, and has now with him one paid curate, one paid Scripture-reader, one paid Bible-woman, and one paid organist. But he has eighty-two voluntary Sunday-school teachers, 120 Churchworkers, seventeen Bible classes, with 600 adults on the register, and 1,700 Sunday-scholars.

The practical and moral results of the Church's work in this parish are patent and unmistakeable. Of course some of the people remain to this day unaffected and careless. But the congregation raises £800 a year for the cause of God. There are 1,100 pledged abstainers in the district. There is not a single house of ill-fame or a single known infidel in the parish.

These are facts, simple facts, which anyone who visits Liverpool may, if he likes, verify for himself. The incumbent of this parish is a quiet, unpretending man, who, perhaps, would not gather a congregation in the Temple, Westminster, or St. Paul's, or fascinate an Oxford or Cambridge University audience. But of one thing I am certain, he is a man who tries to preach Christ in the pulpit, and to visit his people in a Christlike, sympathising way as a pastor, at the rate of seventy-five families a week, and to these two things I attribute his success.

Of course man cannot command success under any circumstances. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth." Nor can such results as those I have just stated be reasonably expected in huge, overgrown, long-neglected parishes of fifeeen or twenty thousand people. In such districts it is no wonder if thousands are slaves of drink, or live in ignorance, worldliness, and sin. Yet even then much may be done by a right incumbent, with a good staff of curates and lay-helpers, and by steadily keeping in view territorial subdivision.

But nothing shall make me flinch from the position, that with a proper supply of clergy, of the right sort, and a reasonable subdivision of our large parishes, we have no reason to despair about the working classes. I will never admit that they are hopelessly sunk in ignorance and infidelity—never, never! I will never admit that they cannot be got to church—never, never! Give us right preaching in every pulpit, accompanied by right house-to-house visiting in every parish, and I believe the working classes will be found the best friends and members of the Church of England. She will become in deed as well as in name "the Church of the people."

The Bishop of Bedford, who was loudly cheered, followed :—

It is obvious enough that public worship is neglected by large masses of the people. Whether this neglect is much greater than it was twenty-five or fifty years ago, it is by no means easy to determine. It is bad enough now. Of course church-going or chapel-going is not the whole of religion, and that there is a certain amount of vague indefinite religious feeling widely diffused among the neglecters of public worship is not to be denied. Yet attendance at a place of worship is as a rule the best available test of respect for religion, as neglect of such attendance is the simplest and most obvious evidence of either indifference or hostility. Of course here we touch at once the causes of the neglect we deplore. The hostile are not likely to come; and, with those large classes which are uninfluenced by public opinion, or influenced the wrong way, the indifferent are not much more likely. We have not advanced our subject much by saying that the reason why irreligious people do not go to church is because they are irreligious. We want to go back a step farther, and to ask what has made them irreligious? We must not forget that evil will always abound, nor expect a miraculous conversion of the people; but there must be something gravely wrong when you can in many large towns go along a street from house to house, or, in the more crowded parts, from room to room, and find scarcely one (perhaps two or three women, and perhaps one man—a marvel and portent among his neighbours—) regularly attending any place of worship. Even in country villages the proportion of labouring men attending church or chapel is very small. Now, that social changes have had something to do with this we cannot doubt. One may sigh over the good old Sir Roger de Coverley days, the humble peasant at the church door hat in hand, with his curtseying wife and awe-struck children, as the squire goes by; but those days are gone, as the feudal days before them. Well, we have got some good things instead—better pay, better food, better houses (at least in the country), and better education. But class feeling and class separation have done much to keep the working man outside the church door. Would to God we could learn the secret of bettering and elevating and invigorating one class without teaching it to hate and envy and misconstrue another! But are there no other causes to be looked for in the very services themselves—causes more easy of detection and of solution—causes touching us of the clergy more closely? In other words, have our services been the best fitted for the people, the best adapted to attract and to edify them? Has there been anything, either in the Church's system, or in our handling of that system, which has generated a distaste for, or indifference to, the public worship of the Church? It is a well-worn objection to say that our Church services are too refined, too elaborate, too scholarly, for the ignorant and uneducated to appreciate. I think rather too much has been made of this, though there is doubtless some truth in it. But there is one thing truer still; and that is, that those who have never learnt to pray, who have never accustomed themselves to realise the Unseen, to whom God is a mere name, an abstract Being at best, with whom they have no conscious personal relations—that such must find anything and everything worthy of the name of worship unreal and unintelligible. Of course for such we want a very elementary presentment of worship. They have to learn the alphabet, or rather they have to learn something before they come to worship at all. They have to learn that God *is*, before they can learn to seek Him. Therefore inability to enter into a Church service is not in itself a proof that the service is faulty either in conception or in rendering. Still it is impossible to deny that our Church service is specially adapted for cultivated minds, that it presupposes some attainment in spiritual things, and that its finished beauty of expression, its careful order, its chastened spirit, are merits which grow upon the devout worshipper, trained in the Church's system and teaching, and are not likely to be detected by the ignorant and unfamiliar visitor. Are we then to level down our services to the rude and elementary ideas of worship which some such ignorant and unfamiliar visitor might bring with him into our churches? God forbid. Surely the Church is bound first of all to meet the wants and fulfil the longings of her most devout and loving children. And, thank God, her services are, in hundreds of churches, devout and helpful to a degree undreamt of by our forefathers. Two questions then seem to suggest themselves—(1) What has the Church failed to do, and what could she do, to make her services more fitted for the classes which now neglect them, without detracting from their beauty and helpfulness to the devout and cultured worshipper? And (2) What has the Church failed to do, and what could she do, to teach the primary idea of worship to the ignorant and careless, and to provide for the wants of those unable as yet to enter into her thoughtful and beautiful ritual?

1. I suppose there is no doubt that to those untrained in worship the sermon always appears the most important part of the service. To listen and learn is a simpler idea than to realise God and pray. The former, in some shape or other, is habitual; the latter is strange, possibly all but unknown. Well, sermons are immensely improved. And they are still capable of immense improvement. I must not enter into this large subject here. Let it suffice to say that, if a poor man is persuaded to come to church, and, when there, first of all quite fails to understand the service, and then quite fails to understand the sermon, he is not much to be blamed if he does not come again; and that, if only our sermons were very simple, very earnest, very loving, very practical, and not too long, a good many more would be glad to hear them. I have no doubt at all that much of the neglect of public worship is to be traced to the dull dry dreary preaching which has too often prevailed. Speak from your heart to the hearts of your people in language they can understand, and listeners will come. But I want rather to speak of the Prayers—taking the word popularly, of the service which precedes the sermon. I do not think it has always been the great aim to make the service intelligible, reverent, and congregational. Without great care a clergyman very easily lapses into an indistinct, over-rapid, indevout manner of saying words with which he is very familiar. I suppose there is no rule like the old one which bids you, if you would say the prayers impressively, to *pray* them. Your own devotion will best teach your people to be devout. Then the Lessons—how often are they read hurriedly, insignificantly, as if it were not of much importance whether they were well understood or no. I am sometimes not a little amused in East London, when I propose to read a Lesson, to observe some little surprise, as if it were just a little *infra dig.* for a Bishop to read the Bible. But let me tell you what always grates upon my ears and distresses me when I hear it. The clergyman begins the service reverently enough, we will assume. He does not aim at a choral service, at least so far as his part is concerned. He simply reads. I like reverent intoning best, but good reading is better than bad intoning. He says the first words of the Confession, and lo! the organ or one of the choir pipes out G, and I know too well what to expect—a Confession said as if it were an act of praise; a gradual descent from beginning to end; the organ probably crashing out the "Amen," of course on G, as much as to say, "There, you see you have flattened a tone and a half;" and the people—Oh, dear! can we hope they will join? Go and kneel among them, and listen how many take part. Now, the Confession is as simple and touching and beautiful as possible, when properly rendered. Thank God for that addition to our Prayer-Book of 1552, so in harmony with the earliest records of Christian worship! Let the Confession be said very softly, very penitently, on a low note, and with no organ for the Amen, and depend upon it the people will not only understand it better, but learn to take their part in it better. This is only a sample to suggest what a little thoughtful attention to the spirit and meaning of the service—perhaps I should say a little common sense—may do to make it intelligible and helpful to all. A thoroughly good choral service is undoubtedly much loved and valued by many, and is to such a help to devotion. But undoubtedly also there are many whom it does not help, and who cannot appreciate it, and it is a mistake to despise a simpler style of service, which may be very reverent and impressive. Only if the service is not fully choral, do let me plead against a high responding note, which inevitably hinders responding. Nothing is more painful than to hear the prayers taken on a low note or on no note at all, and the Amens and other responses taken on a note certainly above the comfortable level of the voices of the people, and sounding the higher by contrast. In such cases it would be far more helpful to intelligent devotion to have the whole responsive part of the service cast in a lower key. I must utter one protest against subservience to the ambition of choirs in the use of difficult or uncongregational music, and pass on, leaving many things unsaid which I should like to say on this part of my subject, and only summing up my remarks by saying that what we must aim at, to make our services attractive to the ignorant as well as helpful to the cultured, is a simple, reverent, solemn, and expressive rendering, with every possible endeavour to make it easy for all to take their appointed part, so that it may be clearly felt that the service is for people as well as priest—a service in which it is the privilege as well as the duty of all to join.

2. I now take up my second point, and ask, Has the Church done all she could, and, if not, what more could she do for the classes who now entirely neglect public worship? I suppose the very fact of this neglect itself proves some neglect or mistake on the part of the Church. We do not want to cloak our faults. And vast masses of our people alienated from, or utterly indifferent to, the Church's ministrations, a "heathen England" to be converted (as the Salvation Army sweepingly affirms), churches half empty, or occupied only by the well-to-do—all this surely tells its tale of past shortcomings. If the Church had been all she might have been to the people, all this could not have been. No doubt the causes have been manifold, and no doubt for many of the causes the Church is not responsible. But for many she is. And whether it has been that her system has been too stiff and unbending and lacking in power of adaptation, or whether it be that her clergy were supine, or worldly, or ill-trained for their special work among the godless and ignorant; or whether it be that her laity, for lack of encouragement or for lack of faith, left all to the clergy, and woke up too late to the great work lying before them, the Church has need to humble herself and confess her shortcomings, and pray for power to undo past mistakes and to repair past neglect. Certainly, the Salvation Army is teaching us one great lesson which we must not be ashamed to learn. With all its faults in a Churchman's eyes, it is assuredly showing us that there is a mighty work of evangelisation to be done by single-minded faith and self-sacrifice. Would that we might copy the faith and self-sacrifice while setting forth a richer, fuller, more reverent type of Christianity! One thing I have said we must not do; we must not lower the glorious ideal of holy worship which God has been leading us up to in these latter days in order to catch the ignorant and careless. We must not depreciate or neglect sacraments, Church order, Church doctrine, while we strain after the conversion of sinners. "This ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone." But, with this principle held fast, surely we must welcome all and everything which can help in the reclamation of the masses. Shorter simpler services, with earnest evangelistic addresses—often addresses with scarcely any service—warm and hearty hymn-singing—we must have these in churches, in schoolrooms, in public halls, in the open air—anywhere. We must not learn to be too squeamish. I do not say that good taste is not often a safeguard of reverence. But we need not wear kid gloves and velvet slippers in order to be reverent. I heartily wish there were more liberty in the use of *additional* services in church. It is very hampering to be limited to the Bible and Prayer-Book. But one thing I would say as regards the Prayer-Book. We can surely teach our people its use even in the very simplest services. Any people will learn to say the Confession all together, as they do the Lord's Prayer. Anybody can understand the General Thanksgiving. Anyone, however ignorant, would soon learn to say the first four suffrages to the Litany. When, at their request, I preached one evening to a corps of the Salvation Army, I was greatly struck by their proposal that one feature in the short service should be the saying all together of the Apostles' Creed. When I went to preach some concluding sermons at the close of a long Mission, conducted last year by Mr. Mark Knowles at Northampton, I was astonished to hear the people in the street, on Saturday night, take up the Confession as it was said by one of the clergy. I named it to Mr. Knowles, and he said, "Oh, I have taught it them;" explaining that during the six weeks he had been there holding services and preaching, under the sanction of the clergy, several times daily, he never omitted to use the Confession, so that the whole town seemed to know it. Surely it must be well thus to familiarise the people with some of the leading features of our worship, so that when they came to church (and we must not be content till they do) they may not find all strange and new. And then, lastly (for I have no time for much I would say), there is the individual dealing with souls—patient, quiet, laborious work. No preaching, no praying, no multiplication of service, will do much without this. And this is the hardest of all. And for this—for all—Oh, what grace, what faith, what zeal, what courage, what love, what humility, are needed! "Who is sufficient for these things?"

Mr. J. Trevarthen said the Church must take a lesson from the Wesleyans and employ local lay preachers. (Hear, hear.) In enthusiasm a lesson might be learnt from the Salvation Army.

Canon Mason read a paper on "The Church and Revival Movements." The permanent value of the Salvation Army would be realised in its influence on the whole Catholic Church. It would show the Church of England what she ought not to do, and challenge Churchmen to consider afresh what missionary agencies she could employ. The Salvation Army also showed the Church what she ought to avoid. Better that the Church should not resort to degrading sensationalism.

Mr. H. F. Bowker wanted to see an army in every parish, organised by the clergyman, to take up the work of the Salvation Army, avoiding extravagance and introducing the love of order, which the Church was so well fitted to sustain. In Richmond, near London, the clergyman and his helpers were taking a leaf out of the book of the Salvation Army.

Mr. Colville was introduced by the president as a former officer of the Salvation Army and now a lay evangelist in the diocese of Lichfield. He said the efforts to reach the masses must be made outside the Church. Their presence at first would drive others out of the churches. Besides, the Prayer-Book was for converted people. There must be special services to prepare the people for the ordinary services. You could not make drawing-room saints of tap-room sinners. Enthusiasm must be tolerated. No cause was more worthy of it.

Lord Nelson said the services of the Church were ordered rather for the higher and the middle classes than for the poor. The churches must be free and open, and the services must be shortened and made suitable for the people. He regretted the attitude of the Church in Wesley's time. It would be different now. The Salvation Army proved that there were people who could be won and organised. He hoped the Church would not let this opportunity slip from her. At first the Salvation Army made converts. Was not the Church bound to do something to carry on this work? It could be done by special services and by organised lay work to assist the clergy.

The Rev. A. Hatchard (of Shoreditch) believed the number of sceptics was greatly exaggerated by Mr. Bradlaugh. He deprecated attracting people by charity tickets, but in the East of London magic lanterns and sociable gatherings had been very successful, independently of the Salvation or any other Army. The people must be attracted by such means.

Captain Barnes advocated the placing of the Stations of the Cross in the churches.

Canon Hoare said he had practised aggression before Mr. Booth was born. (Laughter.)

At nine o'clock the discussion was brought to a close.

The evening meeting in the Temperance Hall was largely attended, the subject discussed being of great importance. It was opened by Canon Gregory, who read the following paper :—

DISCIPLINARY LAWS AS AFFECTING THE CHURCH—CRIMINOUS AND NEGLIGENT CLERKS.

This is the subject which I have been invited to handle, and I must deal with it as a clergyman, not as a lawyer. I must leave courts and modes of procedure, and questions about preliminary investigations, and such like, to more competent hands, and endeavour to show where the present disciplinary laws as they affect the clergy seem to me to be defective and need amendment.

Speaking generally, with respect to the laws for dealing with criminous clerks, I should say that they ignore the special requirements of the clerical office, and treat the peccant clerk as if he were a peccant layman. For his personal sins he is responsible just as a layman is for his; but over and above that, indiscretions, self-indulgences, follies, thoughtless and doubtful ways of speaking and acting, spending days in what is called jovial society or in a ceaseless round of pleasure or amusements, which would argue light-mindedness or want of earnestness of purpose in a layman, become positively sinful in a clergyman. For he is bidden to show himself "a pattern of good works," to "abstain from all appearance of evil," and has pledged himself at his ordination to be "diligent to frame and fashion himself and his family according to the doctrine of Christ, and to make both himself and them as much as in him lieth a wholesome example and pattern to the flock of Christ." When, therefore, the priest fails to do this, he fails to fulfil his obligations to Christ and His Church. The layman can only be made amenable to the laws when by direct act he violates one of their provisions; the priest violates that higher law which he is bound to obey when he places himself in a suspicious or doubtful position; when he is guilty of indiscretions or approximations to evil which may lead those of whose souls he is placed in charge, and to whom he ought to be a pattern and guide, reasonably to imagine that he has been guilty of vices or crimes, though he may possibly have stopped short of perpetrating them. It is impossible to read any ordinary trial of a priest for incontinency or excess without feeling that he deserves to be condemned, though the proof of the consummation of his crime may not be legally complete. That he has sinned against the brethren and against his Divine Master by giving occasion to the enemy to blaspheme is too often certain, and in a commissioned servant of Christ such conduct is a crime, and as such the laws affecting the clergy ought to regard it. They should be framed on a high ideal; they should regard the office as well as the man; they should be at least as thoughtful of the spiritual interests of the flock as they are of the temporal interests of the shepherd. No freehold should bar the power of the Church to free herself from those who cause scandal, or who degrade her ministry by unworthy living. Whilst saying this we have to remember the miserable depths into which godless party spirit will sometimes sink pharisaical partisans, and the need there is to protect the innocent from the suborned accusations of those who think much of their party shibboleths and little of the eternal principles of justice, righteousness, and truth. If our own generation had not seen shameless women charging devoted ministers of Christ with foul sin which their souls abhorred, and for which there was not a tittle of reliable evidence, it would not have been felt to be so necessary to emphasise this caution.

But whilst there is need for an amendment in the laws affecting criminous clerks which will hit this blot, it is refreshing to think how comparatively small is the number of those commissioned to serve Christ in the ranks of the ministry of His Church in this land who can be reckoned as such. I can honestly say that I believe at no period of her history has the Church been served by a more earnest, devoted, and self-denying body of clergy than is the Church of England at this day; but when the army is so large it must be expected that there will be some unworthy soldiers in it, and none are more interested in tightening the reins of discipline, and in doing whatever law can do to expel from their ranks those who, by misconduct or neglect, bring discredit on the service and on the great and holy cause to which they devote their lives, than the faithful clergy themselves.

If we turn to the case of negligent clerks, I fear that much more requires to be said and to be done. As love is the fulfilling of the law, so a large portion of the work of a parish priest can only be really understood or practised by those who love the duties committed to them, and make it the pleasure as well as the business of their life to discharge them as efficiently as possible. For this there can be no adequate substitute. The manner in which the work is performed is as important as the work itself. The usefulness and success of a clergyman's labours depend, to a very great extent indeed, upon the spirit in which they are executed; and the triumphs of the Gospel achieved through his instrumentality will be mainly owing to his reflecting his great Master's sympathy and love and zeal in what he says and does. But whilst fully recognising this it is incumbent upon us to remember that all cannot be expected to be actuated by this highest motive. It would be a miracle indeed if all the 20,000 clergymen who minister in the Church of England were such perfect saints that they needed no law to secure the complete performance of the duties to which they are pledged. We know as a matter of fact that such is not the case, and such can never be expected to be the case. The question then arises, what should be the law of obligation? What requirements should be made upon them which may be enforced by pains and penalties?

As the law now stands the requirements are very small indeed. Whilst the law may be strained to the uttermost to punish excessive zeal, or to imprison clergymen who adopt unusual methods of influencing their flock, or who prematurely revive observances which they think (whether wisely or unwisely, rightly or wrongly, I do not here inquire) may tend to the spread of religion and piety amongst their people, it is certain that it is very tender towards the negligent and slothful. Service may be slovenly and scantily performed; but if the legal *minimum* is fulfilled no one can authoritatively interfere; the prayers may be hurriedly gabbled over, and two short sermons, copied out of a book, or bought from some needy hack who supplies discourses to the clergy after the manner in which impositions are procured by prodigal boys at school, satisfy the law's demands, and the priest who thus performs his Sunday's duties need fear no interference from the Church's courts, and for the most part from no other authority on this side the grave. The Church's schools may be unvisited, or be handed over to a School Board; the Church's children may remain uncatechised and be allowed to grow up with no knowledge of those truths which can make them wise unto salvation; the people may be unvisited; the profligate and those who are out of the way be unwarned; the doubting and the tempted may have no hand held out to rescue them from the unbelief or the vice towards which they are tending; the parish may be left with no efforts to diminish drunkenness, to promote purity, to encourage thrift, to console the afflicted, to guide the young into paths of godliness, and the ecclesiastical law is silent; and if only the parish priest should call at the house of any sick person who may urgently send for him, that law has certainly no terrors for him. I very much doubt whether he may not disregard even this last-named small requirement without any dread of being called to account.

That this is what may be done is, I believe, certain, though I am happy to think that instances of such neglect are comparatively rare. But do not let us flatter ourselves that they do not exist. Let me tell you of two cases which have fallen under my own knowledge; happily both the clergymen of whom I am about to speak have ceased to minister in the Church, but the facts I have upon evidence which is demonstrative. The first was the incumbent of a town parish with a population of about 4,000, none of them very poor or very rich. The parishioners were persons engaged in trades or professions, and were in the enjoyment of adequate but not large incomes. The church was a fairly good one, and had been built comparatively recently; it was well attended, and the incumbent derived an income of several hundreds a year from pew rents. The church was never opened except on Sundays, and then the services were only two. In the morning the incumbent appeared in his own pew in a black gown, or sometimes remained in the vestry to complete the preparation of his sermon, whilst the prayers were being read by a curate. He would never take part in celebrating the offices of the Church beyond preaching his sermon; if the Holy Communion was administered, it mattered not how numerous were the communicants, he received in his black gown, as if a layman, and left the curate to administer in both kinds. He made a rule never to visit a sick person, and during the more than thirty years that he was in charge of the parish he never broke his rule. His own churchwarden was dying, and sent to ask for his ministrations, but he declined to go. Persons who had contributed largely to the erection of his church urgently petitioned him to visit their dying relatives, but in vain. He was never known to pay a parochial visit during his tenure of the cure; and once when I had occasion to call upon him officially he showed me the church, but kept on his hat the whole time, as he told me that he was afraid of the cold. Much of this was told me by the Bishop of the diocese in which his cure lay, but nothing was done, or, perhaps, could be done, as the law now stands.

The other case was in the country, and in a diocese very differently circumstanced. The population was small, under 500, and the income was ample for the work which had to be done. I happened to know a parishioner, who was vicar's churchwarden. His wife died of cancer after an illness of some years; the vicar never saw her during the whole of that time, and was never known to minister to the sick or sad of his flock in their own houses, during the more than twenty years that he held the cure. His wife was very kind in ministering to the temporal wants of the poor; but the spiritual wants of the people were never thought of beyond the performance of the two statutable services on every Sunday.

I imagine there is no Christian person who would hesitate to say that something should be done in such cases as these. If imprisonment, which may be lifelong, is to be considered an equitable punishment for an earnest clergyman who refuses to plead in a court which he believes to contravene the authority which Christ the Lord committed to His Church, and which all thoughtful persons who have examined the question must feel to have been constituted in a manner difficult to reconcile with fundamental principles, which until quite recently had always governed the relations of Church and State, what ought to be the doom of such negligent shepherds as I have described, who feed themselves and not the flock of which they are placed in charge, but suffer the wolf to devour it, and the pestilence to destroy it?

So far there would probably be general agreement; divergence of opinion arises when we seek to amend our system. Two knotty points have to be settled; and the settlement has to be set forth in definite legal language. The points are—(1) What shall be the requirements that a parish priest can be compelled by law to fulfil? and (2) Who is to determine whether such requirements have been fulfilled?

1. What shall be the requirements? Here we must bear in mind that we have not to set forth the ideal of what a parish priest ought to be, but to describe a standard to which the least worthy must attain. For "the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly, and for sinners" (1 Tim. i. 9); and, therefore, in describing legal demands upon the clergy, we must take care to limit such demands to obvious duties. If we require more than this, two evils will follow—(1) the law will generally become a dead letter, for no one will venture to put it into operation when its requirements are felt to be excessive; and (2), if ever it should be attempted to enforce it, popular sympathy will be on the side of the accused, and more harm than good would certainly result.

This, then, is the first condition required in any change that may be made in the law; the second is that no mention should be made of the spirit in which a clergyman should fulfil the duties of his office, but only of acts which he may be called upon to perform. It is quite true that the success of his ministry will largely depend upon the spirit in which he fulfils what he has to do; it is not less certain that his fellow man may egregiously misinterpret the spirit in which he acts. Party spirit, personal bias, want of sympathy may easily distort the motives of another, and so under cover of pretended zeal for the furtherance of the Church's cause inflict great and undeserved wrong. Anxious as I am to see the ranks of the clergy purged from those of their number who fail to discharge efficiently the important functions committed to them, I am not less anxious to preserve all from the irritation and loss which must result from their being unfairly assailed.

A third point to be borne in mind is that in any enumeration of required duties we practically free those of whom the law would even take notice from all obligations not included in such enumeration. A court of law would probably narrow down to the uttermost its interpretation of the requirements of duty of which it is empowered to take notice; if the parish priest had visited the sick and dying person even once or twice during a long illness; if he had been known ever so occasionally to visit his parishioners; if he had entered his school ever so casually, it is probable that he would be held to have visited his sick parishioners, cared for those who are whole, and discharged his duty with respect to the schools of which he was in charge, so far as the law could take cognisance of the acts.

With these difficulties to overcome, how shall we attempt to make more stringent the discipline of the clergy, and insist upon the few careless and negligent members of their body performing in a more worthy manner the duties of their office?

It seems to me that we might take as the basis of obligation the promises made by every priest when he received from the Bishop the power to minister in this Church of England. He then bound himself to give all faithful diligence to minister the doctrines and sacraments and discipline of Christ as this Church and Realm hath received the same; to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word, and to use both public and private monitions and exhortations as well to the sick as to the whole within his cure, as need shall require and occasion shall be given. Besides this he promised to use all dilligence in fashioning his own life and that of his family; in reading and studying and praying and in maintaining quietness, peace, and love amongst all Christian people. Concerning the latter portion of these obligations it would not be possible to examine satisfactorily; not so with respect to the former. All could tell when they were grossly neglected, when no attempt was made to fulfil them, when they were practically ignored. And it is for those who thus offend that I desire to see a law provided, so that the Bishops may not be powerless, as they now practically are, when an idle, worthless incumbent defies their authority, and, sheltering himself behind his legal obligations, refuses to do anything which he cannot be compelled by law to do.

Equitably and successfuly to enforce even such a low standard of obligation would require a court in whose decisions all would have confidence; the possibility of party spirit or personal malice being able to use such a court for its own purposes must be diminished as far as possible; the aim of all interested in the well-being of the Church must be to remove from the cognisance of such a court all questions of doctrine or discipline or interpretation of rubrics about which there are differences of opinion amongst those who loyally seek the prosperity of our spiritual Zion. A joint committee of the Upper and Lower Houses of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, ably presided over by the Bishop of Exeter, agreed to recommend that the definition of what constitutes inadequate performance of duty on the part of a clergyman should include the neglect not only "of the regular performance of Divine service on Sundays and holydays," but also of such as are solemnly promised by every clergyman of the Church of England at the time of his admission to the holy orders of that Church. The same committee recommended "that the Commissioners to inquire into any charge of inadequte performance of duty be the Archdeacon or the Rural Dean at the discretion of the Bishop, a Canon Residentiary of the Cathedral elected by the Dean and Chapter, two beneficed clergymen of the archdeaconry, elected for not more than three years by the beneficed clergy of the archdeaconry at the Archdeacon's visitation, to whom the incumbent concerned should be allowed to add a fifth, being also a beneficed clergyman of the diocese." To these recommendations the Lower House agreed, but in the Upper House it was thought desirable to add to the obligations of duty promised by every priest at his ordination, the words, "which may reasonably be required from every one who has cure of souls," and to substitute "one layman, being a Justice of the Peace, resident within the limits of the archdeaconry," for one of the two clergymen to be elected by the clergy of the archdeaconry. These amendments were accepted by the Lower House, and so became the act of the Southern Convocation.

We have therefore the authority of the Southern Convocation for asserting that such a reform as I have been advocating is desirable, and we have a very definite manner of making such reform set before us by the same high authority. I should be very glad to find that this recommendation approved itself to the clergy generally, and that they would do all in their power to secure its being eventually sustained by Parliamentary law. I believe that such a change in the law would remove some of the scandals by which the Church's all-important work is hindered; our advocacy of it will seem to show that we are anxious to do what we can to get rid of all impediments to the full and fair administration of discipline, and that we consider it no privilege to be screened from suffering harm and loss if we neglect our spiritual duties. To administer discipline must at all times be a difficult and irksome task, and all experience shows that it is ever marked with undue leniency towards the idle and unworthy, and towards all who do not arouse against themselves excessive indignation by gross crimes, or partisan hostility by the advocacy of principles or practices to which another partyor school of opinion is opposed. We need not, therefore, be afraid that if a charge is made undue severity will be meted out to offenders; we are satisfied that such will never be the case. But, be that as it might, we are bound as faithful ministers of the New Testament to do what we can to advance the kingdom and glory of our Divine King, and one way in which we can do this is to secure that unworthy persons shall be excluded from holding commissions in His army, and so from betraying the cause for which we all are sworn to contend to the utmost.

Canon TREVOR followed with the following paper:—

CHURCH COURTS.

The Church Courts have been of late years so completely appropriated by the legal profession that a clergyman runs the risk of being warned off as a trespasser in discussing their constitution. My apology is twofold—(1) that the Church Courts belonged to the clergy before the legal profession was born; and (2) that we are still the only class of Her Majesty's subjects who are bound to know anything about them. A layman—even a lawyer—may pass his days in blissful ignorance of their existence; a clergyman cannot say, or not say, his daily prayers without their judicial correction. In point of fact, no lawyer enters a Church Court without being paid for it, just as no one makes shoes except to sell. The clergy, who are forced to wear the article, have a right to show where the shoe pinches. The truth is, they are making us wear other people's shoes; and it is no wonder they do not fit.

The Church Courts were instituted to correct the laity for their souls' health, and our Protestant people liked the discipline so little that they kicked themselves clean out, and preferred to go about barefoot. Then the lawyers, not to lose a profitable trade, took to forcing the shoes upon us in utter disregard to spiritual corns. They have turned the Church Courts into lay tribunals for the prosecution of the clergy at the suit of their parishioners.

This grotesque revolution is often attributed to the vindication of the Royal supremacy at the Reformation. It has really been brought about within my own recollection, and mostly by the very modern practice of "legislation by inadvertence."

I have traced the whole course in a pamphlet, published by Parkers, to which I must refer you for the proof of what I have now to compress into twenty minutes. Since then I have read a very different account by the learned barrister who was announced to follow me on the present occasion. I am sorry he has thrown up his brief, but I must just say a word by way of putting you on your guard. His theory is briefly this: that while the Church possesses a legislative authority in Convocation (which, by the way, she is not allowed to exercise), she has intrusted the State with the execution of her laws. It is for the Church, he says, to decree rites and ceremonies. The enforcing of the decree she leaves to the State. She keeps the doctrine in her own hands, and confides the discipline to the Crown. In this discipline he comprises the powers of erecting tribunals for all Church matters, of nominating the Judges, making the rules of procedure, inventing penalties, and superintending their infliction.

This is what modern legislation has brought us to! When I was ordained there was not a single Court, and never had been one, answering to any part of this theory. There were no Ecclesiastical Judges nominated by the Crown, no State rules of procedure, no State-invented penalties. The Ecclesiastical Courts were the Courts of Bishops and Archbishops. The Judges were their delegates. The process was for the souls' health of the parties, and regulated down to the very fees by the canons of the Church. The penalties were the spiritual censures of admonition, suspension, deprivation, penance, and excommunication. They were remitted by absolution. The powers, in short, were those of the keys which Christ gave to His Church, and no Christian State ever claimed to invent or possess.

I admit the difference now. Mr. Dibdin's theory fairly fits the Court of Lord Penzance, with the exception that nothing has been "confided" to it by the Church. And just because it answers to Mr. Dibdin's theory, Lord Penzance's Court is denied to be a Church Court at all. Indeed it is self-evident that on this theory there never could be a Church Court. The Ecclesiastical Courts must be State Courts for the discipline of the Church, just as courts-martial are for the disclpline of the Army and Navy. A *Court* exists for discipline, and not legislation, Surely this is letting the cat out of the bag! I could understand a lawyer trying to persuade the Church, like the fox that had lost its tail, that it is pleasanter and more fashionable to be without that hirsute appendage; but it is too much to tell poor Reynard that his brush never really grew on his own body, but was *always* flourished over his head by a horseman in pink and top boots. This may be law—crowner's quest law—but it is not natural history nor any other history.

The fallacy lies in confounding the Court with the sheriff's officer. A Church Court has no jurisdiction over persons or property; it proceeds *pro salute animæ* by purely spiritual censures, its authority is exhausted in excommunication. If any temporal effect is to follow it must be by the law of the land administered by the secular arm. But the temporal effect is not the discipline of the Church, nor any part of it—her object is the soul's health of the offender. The Court, the Judges, the process, the sentence, are all her own. They bind and loose *in foro conscientiæ*, a region beyond the dominion of the State. The corporal penalty is the Crown's; but so far from the Church having confided her discipline to the Crown or the State, the historical fact is that the Crown has invested the Church with some of its own temporal jurisdiction, in aid of the Divine authority which she inherits from the Apostles of Christ. The temporal adjunct has been enlarged and restricted from time to time; but I assert, without fear of contradiction, that from the establishment of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction at the Norman Conquest to the passing of the Public Worship Regulation Act, every ecclesiastical Court in this kingdom was the Court of a spiritual Prelate sitting in person, or by his commissary, to judge spiritual causes, by the canons of the Church, and for the souls' health of the parties.

The powers of such a Court are twofold—first and principally, the spiritual authority of the Prelate's office in the Church; and secondly, the legal jurisdiction accorded him by the State. The first is *jure divino*, the second *jure humano*. One is a matter of law, the other of religion. The lawyers do well to watch over the jurisdiction that comes from their master; they must allow the clergy to be no less jealous for the authority of the King of kings.

This is the language of all our legal authorities down to the present reign. Lord Coke, who was no friend to the Church, expressly asserts that "the cognisance of causes ecclesiastical belongeth not to the common laws of England," and he adds this caution, "Certain it is that this kingdom hath been best governed and preserved when both parties—that is, when the Justices of the Temporal Courts, and the Ecclesiastical Judges have kept themselves within their proper jurisdiction without encroaching or usurping one upon another; and where such encroachments or usurpations have been made they have sown the seeds of great trouble and inconvenience."

In the Colenso case, the Judicial Committee said, "Pastoral or spiritual authority may be incidental to the office of a Bishop, but all jurisdiction where it can be lawfully conferred must proceed from the Crown and be exercised as the law directs; and suspension or privation of office is matter of coercive legal jurisdiction and not of mere spiritual authority." Observe the word *mere*; they do not say that spiritual authority is not required to deprive of spiritual functions, or that the Crown is possessed of such spiritual authority, but that something more is required, when the office carries temporal rights, and that is the jurisdiction which the Bishop derives from the Crown.

Again, in another judgment, by the Master of the Rolls, Sir John Romilly says, "In all the works that I have consulted on this subject the powers and authority of a Bishop are classed under three heads—1, *Ordo*; 2, *Jurisdictio*; 3, *Administratio rei familiaris*. The power of order he derives from his consecration, which, according to the doctrine of the Catholic Church of Christ, of which the Church of England is a branch, is a sacred authority derived by direct descent from the Apostles. By this power so conferred on him, he may transmit the spirituol power he possesses to others—he can ordain deacons and priests, consecrate churches, administer confirmation."

Under the second head, the power of legal coercive jurisdiction, the Letters Patent were found to be invalid, because the Crown was not competent to confer it in the colony of Natal. It followed that the Bishop could hold no Court of his own, but must proceed against offenders in the temporal Courts of the colony.

Here is the distinction between an established Church and one that is not established. The Colonial Churches, the Scottish Church, and now the Irish, as well as the Roman Catholic Church and other communions in England having no legal Courts of their own, must, as Mr. Dibdin says, "confide their discipline" to the Courts of the Crown. The ecclesiastical jurisdiction means exactly the reverse; not that the Church confides her discipline to the Crown, but that the Crown confers a legal jurisdiction on the Bishop, in aid of the sacred authority derived to him in consecration by direct descent from the Apostles, who received it from Christ. The jurisdiction conferred by the King he can enlarge or restrict, but the spiritual authority derived from the Apostles the King can neither give nor take away. I venture to affirm that Lord Penzance is the only person who ever claimed to sit as Judge in a Church Court (either before or after the Reformation) without a canonical delegation from the spiritual Prelate whose Court it was.

The distinction between the two powers is clearly laid down in the original charter of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction by William the Conqueror. The Courts there named are the Archdeacon's and the Bishop's; their jurisdiction is in matters pertaining to the cure of souls; they are to proceed by the canons of the Church, and if the sentence of excommunication be defied, resort may be had to the justice of the King or the Sheriff; but no King's officer or other layman is to intromit in the spiritual proceeding. The Church canons provided an appeal from the Bishop to the provincial synod, the original Court of the Archbishop, and the supreme tribunal of the National Church of England. And in promising the aid of the secular arm the *justitia regis* necessarily retained the subject's right to be heard against the sentence. But these are clearly not *in pari materia*. The appeal to the Archbishop in synod is part of the spiritual process; it results in remitting or confirming the Bishop's sentence. But the King can neither excommunicate nor absolve. For him to try the case over again on the Church canons would be the very lay intromission which the charter forbids. He gives or refuses the action of the secular arm, as he deems just. He may require the Bishop to reconsider the case, and even compel him to do his duty. But he cannot usurp the spiritual power to himself. The appeal is what the French law termed the *appel comme d'abus*, and the canonists *tanquam ab abusu*. It was the kind of control which our temporal Courts now exercise over the ecclesiastical by *mandamus* and prohibition.

The course of appeal is clearly laid down in the Constitutions of Clarendon, 1164. The Church Courts then claimed jurisdiction in all offences, temporal or spiritual, charged upon clerks in orders—not only priests and deacons, but all the lower orders of the Church. These were the "criminous clerks" whom the Courts were meant to correct. There was another process for irregularities of ritual and doctrinal error, The complaint was that the Bishops suffered the culprits to defeat the King's justice by indefinite appeals to Rome. It was resolved that appeals should be from the Archdeacon to the Bishop, and from the Bishop to the Archbishop, and "if the Archbishop should be slack in doing justice, resort was to be had to the King, by whose command the cause was to be terminated in the Archbishop's Court, and proceed no further—*i.e.*, not by appeal to Rome without the Royal licence."

We find exactly the same course repeated at the Reformation. The Act for Restraint of Appeals, 24 Henry VIII., c. 12, begins with the famous preamble, affirming the power of the body spiritual, that—

> When any cause of the law divine happened to come in question, or of spiritual learning, it was declared, interpreted, and showed by that part of the body politic called the spiritualty, now being usually called the English Church, which always hath been reputed and also found of that sort, that both for knowledge, integrity, and sufficiency of number, it hath been always thought, and is also at this hour, sufficient and meet of itself without the intermeddling of an exterior person or persons to declare and determine all such doubts and to administer all such offices and duties as to their rooms spiritual doth appertain.

On this ground the rejection of the Papacy is rested. It is the main principle of the Reformation settlement. The Act proceeds to enact that appeals shall be within the realm, and in no other manner than from the Archdeacon to the Bishop and from the Bishop to the Archbishop, "there to be definitively and finally ordered, decreed, and adjudged according to justice without any other appellation or provocation to any other person or persons, Court or Courts." The King himself cannot now license an appeal to Rome. The Archbishop's Court is restored to its authority as the supreme Church Court within the realm. The resort to the King followed in the Act of Submission passed the next year, in the exact words of the Constitutions of Clarendon:—"And for lack of justice in the Courts of the Archbishop it shall be lawful for the parties grieved to appeal to the King in Chancery, and upon every such appeal a Commission shall be directed under the Great Seal to such persons as shall be named by the King to hear and definitively terminate the appeal." This was the origin of the Court of Delegates, now replaced by the Judicial Committee. You will observe that the appeal is still in the old phrase "for lack of justice;" the only change is that instead of remitting the cause to the Archbishop's Court, the King is to issue a separate Commission on each appeal to persons of his own selection. This enabled the Crown to call in the legal profession, then becoming distinct from the clergy, on testamentary and other appeals involving questions of temporal law. Some modern lawyers tell us that this provision was in repeal of the previous Act, and constituted the Crown the Final Court of Appeal in the Established Church. But this interpretation was never heard of till after the Court of Delegates had given place to the Judicial Committee; even then it was ruled by the Court of Exchequer in the Gorham case, 1850, that "the statute of 25 Henry VIII., c. 19, did but restore the ancient law of the land as settled on this point by the Constitutions of Clarendon in the reign of Henry II., A.D. 1164." It would be strange indeed if, after resting the rejection of the Papacy on the power and sufficiency of the English Church, its authority were supplanted the very next year by a side-wind, and replaced by the wholly different power of the Crown. No such gloss is found in history. The two Acts were both repealed by Queen Mary, and both revived in the 1st Elizabeth. They have always been in concurrent operation. There is not a word in the later Act to prevent the Crown from remitting a spiritual cause to the Archbishop's Court as before; indeed, it is done by the Judicial Committee to this day. The *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, a contemporary exposition, shows that the intention was to remit such appeals to a select number of Bishops, and in graver cases to the synod. This was, in fact, the old practice of the Archbishop's Court. Before and long after the Reformation the Prelates held their Courts in person, leaving the routine only to their officials. The Archbishop sat alone, or with three or four of his comprovincial suffragans; if the case was important enough he summoned the whole synod. Thus Cranmer, after the invalidity of the King's marriage had been synodically determined in Convocation, gave sentence of nullity at a Court composed of himself and a few of his suffragans. To give the Queen a show of appeal, the Act provided that in causes touching the King the party grieved might appeal to the Upper House of Convocation. This was not a special tribunal (as has been lately imagined) for the King's causes, but the full Court of the Archbishop. The purport of the enactment was to remove all doubt of its jurisdiction over the King's person, whose prerogative would otherwise set him above the jurisdiction of his subjects.

The jurisdiction of Convocation was recognised by Lord Coke in the reign of James I., and affirmed by the Crown and the Judges in questions of heresy as late as Queen Anne. Bishop Burnet says the delegates referred a case to Convocation, and I see nothing to prevent the Judicial Committee from advising Her Majesty in Council to do the same now. In point of fact, it was not till Convocation fell into abeyance for political ends that its jurisdiction as the Supreme Court of the National Church was forgotten.

I say, then, that no substantial change was made in the Church Courts or in the relation to the Crown at the Reformation. There was an extensive alteration in the discipline itself, but none in the Church Courts to enforce it. That the jurisdiction of the Pope was then transferred to the Crown is a vulgar error. The Papacy was a purely spiritual authority in right of the Holy See. It never had any legal jurisdiction in England. Its power over the monastic churches exempt from the Bishops was appropriated to the Crown; but that did not touch the Courts of the Established Church. The only thing that gives colour to the error is that under the title of Supreme Ordinary, invented by Pope Martin V., the Crown set up a *quasi*-Papal tribunal in the Court of High Commission. But this was neither a Church Court nor a Court of Appeal. It was the King's Court, a Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, making rather than expounding law in all matters ecclesiastical by a jurisdiction in every sense "original" and despotic. This Court of Commission was a *Cæsaro-Papacy*, if you like, and we know what became of it. It brought the King and the Archbishop to the headsman's block; it overthrew the Church and the Throne in the Great Rebellion; when revived after the Restoration it cost the Monarch his crown by a second revolution; and then an indignant nation solemnly repudiated it in the Bill of Rights, "with all other Commissions and Courts of like nature as illegal and pernicious."

While this Court lasted the Church Courts were pretty well shunted off the line, and when they recovered free action at the Revolution they were weakened by the lack of precedents and the exemption of the laity under the Toleration Acts. Then Convocation disappeared, and the era of "modern law" began. Its precedents were drawn from the illegal and pernicious tyranny of the Tudors and Stuarts in the extinct Court of High Commission, much more than from the constitutional relations of the Church Courts.

The Judicial Committee was the first step. It was a wise and salutary reform for the objects in view. It erected a strong appellate tribunal from the Courts of Admiralty and the numerous Courts of India and the Colonies, which greatly needed a central and uniform administration. The ecclesiastical appeals were the least numerous, and related for the most part to the testamentary and matrimonial jurisdiction since removed to a temporal Court. The doctrinal appeals which concern the purely spiritual authority were so rare that they were altogether overlooked. This we know from Lord Brougham, the author of the measure, and there can be no question it was a piece of legislative inadvertence not unnatural in the long abeyance of Convocation. Like the hedgehog in the fable, the lawyers having got into the Court of Delegates turned the spirituality clean out and began to refurnish our home for themselves. The Church Discipline Act of 1840 tried to cure the blunder by adding the three Privy Council Prelates, who have been since replaced by a *rota* from the whole Episcopate. These devices only result in a reproduction of the High Commission Court. Two or three Bishops cannot turn the Crown Court into a Church Court, any more than a couple of clerical justices can make a Church Court out of the Petty Sessions. What this act really did was unconsciously to abolish the rights of the dormant Convocation, and promote the Crown Court to the character, never assumed by the delegates, of a Church Court of Final Appeal.

The mistake was discovered at the delivery of the Gorham judgment, and from that time to this the Judicial Committee has supplied a succession of party triumphs and increasing disquietude to moderate men. It floods the Church with litigation, to the profit of the lawyers and the scandal of religion. It has settled nothing, and unsettled much that was quiet before. It is vain to suppose that questions of doctrine and ritual can be settled by what is called the legal construction of Church rubrics and canons. The legal meaning is the true, literal, grammatical, and historical meaning. The legal profession has no gift of tongues, or of the interpretation of tongues. It has no monopoly of grammar, logic, or history. Common law Judges are the rightful expositors of common and statute law, because it is their professional study, and they are trained by experience and practice in the subject matter. By the same rule they are not the rightful expositors of canons and rubrics, which they neither study nor practise, and in the subject matter of which they take no interest. The impartiality which comes from contempt or indifference is no qualification. Of course, a Judge may be a divine, and a Bishop may be a lawyer; but of all interpreters, whether of law or divinity, the least trustworthy is the clever man, who, giving his life to the other profession, gets up a judgment, or a charge, from a few "half-hours with the best authors." The Church Article insists that we give *not* our princes the ministering either of God's word or of the Sacraments. Yet the advisers of the Prince take upon themselves to decide what is and is not God's Word. They prescribe to the priest, to whom the ministry of the Sacraments *is* given, his place, posture, dress, gesture, and even the intention of the holy office; they determine the sacred elements themselves, and who is to receive them; they take the *not* out of the Article, and scrupulously restore it to the Ornaments Rubric!

Now, the Judicial Committee have no authority to do all this, and all the statutes of the realm could not give it them. This is the great defect. In the temporal Court the decree of the Judges makes law if it was not so before, and it takes effect, whatever we may think of its justice or logic. But religion is not a matter of goods and chattels. In religious questions no judgment can be effectual that is void of spiritual authority. That is why we have Church Courts. Nobody would ever acknowledge the spiritual authority of the High Commission Court, and nobody will ever acknowledge it in the Judicial Committee. The Salvation Army has a better chance.

The first thing Mr. Gorham did was to repudiate the doctrine ascribed to him in the judgment that acquitted him. The Bishop of London and more than half the clergy repudiated what was ascribed to the Church. No one accepted the doctrine laid down in the *Essays and Reviews*, or the Bennett judgment. They were welcomed on one side and resented on the other as party triumphs; but everybody of all parties continued to believe as before, and nobody of any party ever happens to believe with the Judicial Committee. It is the same with the ritual judgments. First the vestments and the eastward position were pronounced legal; then both were adjudged illegal; and now the eastward position is tolerated by law and the vestments are not. But who cares for this sort of law? Bishops and clergymen fling the judgments at an adversary's head, but for themselves they go on as they did before; or if any change is made it is in opposition to the judgment. The Judicial Committee is a temporal Court, and all the power of man cannot give it the authority *in foro conscientiæ* which Christ gave to His Church.

As soon as the difficulty was felt, Bishop Blomfield brought in a Bill to refer spiritual questions to the whole Episcopate separately and synodically congregated. That was before the revival of Convocation. Now the Committees of the Lower Houses of both provinces recommend a return to the Reformation settlement, under which the appeal was to the spiritual Prelates of the Upper House of Convocation, the true and original Supreme Court of the English Church. To soothe the bigotry of the lawyers, I have suggested that their determination should be taken (as of old) in the Archbishop's Court before resorting to the Crown. Then, if the lawyers will only keep within the law, the Judicial Committee will have no call to meddle with the determination of the spiritualty but may advise the Crown on the questions of temporal law involved in the appeal. Thus, in the words of the famous Act of Henry VIII., "both these authorities and jurisdictions would conjoin together in the due administration of justice, the one to help the other."

The Act of 1840, though entitled "an act for better enforcing Church discipline," is really only for the correction of clerks, and beginning with the repeal of an old Act "for Bishops to punish priests for dishonest lives," it shows the kind of offences primarily in view. Unfortunately the language is wide enough to include all manner of charges—ritual, doctrinal, and moral—which are properly the subjects of very different procedures. The Act was intended to restore the personal authority of the Bishop, but after getting rid of the Diocesan Court, converting the Archbishop's Court into the Court of First Instance, and the Judicial Committee into the Court of Appeal, it turned out that less than ever remained to the Bishop. The very Commission which he appoints to assist him has been ruled to be his master. Absolutely nothing is left to the Bishop but the right of initiation, which the Courts would have interpreted away the other day but for the gallant defence of the Bishop of Oxford, and which is now the subject of attack in the Legislature. This Act has been described by Sir R. Phillimore as "a hybrid statute, half common law, half ecclesiastical, and half nobody knows what." The third half, I presume, means the noxious gases generated by the mixture of the other two. This is always the fate of Bishops' Bills. They are brought into Parliament pure carbonate of Episcopacy; there they meet the tartaric acid of law, and they come out fizzing and flying nobody knows where or what.

An unusually large amount of "nobody knows what" distinguishes the Public Worship Regulation Act, the last of the Parliamentary blasts that have turned our decorous old Church of England into a perfect cave of Æolus. The Bishops did not know it contained any powers of imprisonment. Lord Chancellor Cairns, who remodelled the Bishops' Bill, did not know that his first-class judge was to fight for his jurisdiction with the Chief Justice of England, to be turned out of Lambeth by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to be hung up in the air till the House of Lords have decided whether he can legally come down in Committee-room E. The House of Commons, who passed the Act in a Protestant panic, did not know that out of the 20,000 clergy only fifteen could be hunted up for prosecution; that in eight of the fifteen cases the aggrieved parishioners would be snuffed out by the Bishops; that five more would founder in the Court provided for their relief, and only two of the proud armada reach the desired haven. No one knew or imagined that they were passing an Act to keep a clergyman in prison seventeen months for his religious opinions, while the parishioners legally aggrieved by his ministrations are besieging heaven and earth for his return. Considering that £70,000 have been spent in litigation under this disastrous Act, it must be allowed that one man in Lancaster Castle is uncommonly dear at the price.

If the Act of 1840 was a blunder, the Act of 1874 was a crime. It was aimed at a party, and however little we may like the party—and it is we old Anglicans who have most right to complain of it—the clergy and Church of England as a body do not believe in party persecution. We do not want a "sorrowful secession;" people are far more troublesome outside the door than inside. We want freedom and fair play all round. If you could burn your adversaries it would be worth thinking of; but it is of no use to imprison them, and you would have the house down on your head before you could put them out.

This is exactly where the spiritual authority is wanted; and this Act takes away the Church Courts altogether, to set up a common law judge in their place, whose qualifications for determining questions of the law divine and of spiritual learning have been acquired in judicially putting asunder those whom God by matrimony had made one. It was not a bad appointment for pronouncing a divorce between Church and State.

By a marvel of legal ingenuity and of Episcopal inadvertence, Lord Penzance has become possessed of the legal jurisdiction of both Archbishops, without any commission from either. The spiritual authority remains with the Archbishops, and the legal jurisdiction is gone to Lord Penzance with a separate maintenance. This is the real key of Lancaster gaol.

The Archbishops are, in fact, disestablished. There is a precedent, and only one that I can find. By one of the last Acts that received the Royal Assent of Charles I., when the Primate was in the Tower, and a little before both were brought to the block, all the Bishops were deprived of their authority and the ecclesiastical jurisdiction was vested in a Committee of the House of Commons.

In the present case the prodigious innovation was wholly gratuitous, and without assignable object. If a single Judge were required for both provinces, the same person could have been canonically commissioned by each Archbishop without any Act of Parliament. The introduction of the Crown into the appointment only tends to efface the spiritual authority. This is the whole bent of modern legislation. The only good point in the statute is the power given to the Bishop to defeat it by his mere *ipse dixit*. If their Lordships had been as wise as they are after the event they would have taken good care that not a single case ever got into Court. And then what is the use of the Act? The Bishop's authority was far greater under the provisions of the Prayer-Book. These have proved sufficient in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. The difficulty is in the rare exceptions, when the Bishop's directions are objected to as against the law of the Church. And what is the remedy provided by the Act? Why, that the Bishop shall require both parties to submit to his direction, whether legal or illegal! It will not let the Bishop decide the law, but it would enable him to order a clergyman who is legal overmuch to break the law. The condition is unpractical and un-English. If the clergyman submitted to it, the lay complainants never would, unless they were sure of the Bishop. And this is just what is meant. The Bishop is to rule the clergy without law, and the laity are to keep the law for themselves, whenever they want it. And then you call the clergy "lawless." When this preposterous condition fails, what does the Act require of the Bishop, our Father in God? He is to take his fellow-servant by the throat and deliver him to the Judge, and the Judge to the officer, and he is cast into prison, while the beds are sold from under his wife and children to pay the costs. This is the law of the land—not the law as the Bishops or the Legislature meant it to be; but what the lawyers have made it. Secretaries of State, Attorneys-General, Vicars-General, and the workmen of like occupation who, "by this craft have their wealth," shout, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." But Christian people are shocked and scandalised at a revival of the Inquisition in the nineteenth century.

The proper remedy, as I have said, is to strengthen the canonical and spiritual authority of the Bishop in taking order to appease diversities of ritual. This, I believe, would be effectually accomplished by a preliminary Court of Conciliation—carefully shutting out the lawyers—such as the Lower House of Convocation at York have just submitted to the Bishops and the Royal Commission. Nothing more would then be heard of ritual litigation. But this is not what modern lawyers like. The ecclesiastical jurisdiction was established to mark the difference between the authority of the Church and that of the State. It was to be a witness of the kingdom which is in the world and not of it. When the foreign Papacy had usurped on both, the line was drawn again, broadly and distinctly, under the Royal supremacy at the Reformation. Then the Crown began to encroach, and after a long weakening of the distinction from political motives, the aim of the last forty years has been to efface it, and absorb the spiritual jurisdiction in the temporal. On the other hand, the Church, awakening to a truer sense of her Divine mission, demands the restoration of her own by a return to the Reformation settlement. All over the country you see the clergy and laity of the Church uniting to present their Bishops with the pastoral staff, the symbol of spiritual and canonical authority. In this is the promise of peace. What modern legislation aims at is to strike it out of his hand as an illegal ornament, and replace it by a policeman's *bâton*. This is the road to litigation, disestablishment, and chaos.

Mr. James Parker, of Oxford, read the next paper on

CANONICAL OBEDIENCE.

The Church of Christ upon earth appears to be subjected, by God's providence, to conditions very similar to those which affect human institutions; so much so, that with some writers its Divine origin, even when theoretically admitted, seems in their arguments often to be practically ignored. But, however much human accidents may be allowed to obscure the Divine character, they cannot obliterate it; indeed, the cavils and controversies and prosecutions arising from disputes about matters which, from the world's point of view, are but trivial, are, when rightly weighed, but evidence of the special means which God's providence has chosen to work out His designs.

It is so with the Bible: God's own word has by God's own providence been alway, and in our time especially, subjected to the ordinary circumstances attending the dissemination of secular literature. For what is the Bible, in its first aspect, but an article of commerce, produced by the same mechanical contrivances as any other book or product of human manufacture, and in its outward appearance so like any other book that the casual observer would not discern any difference? Again, it is subjected, as other books, to the same laws of copyright, of distribution, of competition, and the like. And as this subjection to human laws does not invalidate the authority of the Bible as the word of God, so neither must the apparent subjection of the Church at times to human laws be accepted as any argument for its purely human status, or militate against its Divine origin.

Still more clearly is exhibited the analogy between the Church and the Bible, and especially that portion of the Bible with which we, as Christians, are mostly concerned when we regard the two historically. The chronicles of the four Evangelists, and the letters of St. Paul and of other Apostles, follow in the same course as chronicles and letters, of the same age, recording political history, or treating of secular matters. The MSS. have been subjected to the same human accidents such as the variation by successive copyists; and, therefore, the same doubts have been permitted to arise as to what were the exact words of the original text; and, more than all, the very selection of such chronicles and letters from out of many was, by God's providence, allowed to be dependent on human choice. The history of that selection which came to be called the canon, when duly considered, presents perhaps more striking evidence than can elsewhere be found of the responsibilities entrusted to human agency. And together with the canon of the New Testament there was established a canon of doctrine and practice, by which the truths of the sacred writings were to be made known, explained, and brought home to God's people. Cognate, and coincident with the canon of Scripture, the canon of the Church was in no wise second to it in authority. Indeed it could not be so, for the same human agency was employed in determining the one canon as in establishing the other. "It is just as incorrect," writes Dr. Westcott, who has more closely than any living divine investigated this matter—"it is just as incorrect to say that the doctrine of the Church was originally derived from Scripture, as to say that Scripture was limited by Apostolic tradition. The canon of the Scripture and the canon of the truth were alike independent, but necessarily coincided in their contents so long as they both retained their original purity."

Nor must it be overlooked that the formation of the one canon and the other was equally gradual. The greater part of the second century was occupied in collecting the material of the books of the New Testament, and it was not till the persecution of Diocletian that it is supposed the stimulus was given to decide upon what books should be held to be "standard;" and, finally, it was not till the Council of Carthage, that is, after 400 years had elapsed from the birth of Christ, that the authority of the standard became recognised, and the canon fixed.

Just so was it with the Rule of Faith. Council after Council was held; erroneous doctrines, like uncanonical books, were separated from the others, and by this gradual sifting process the canon of the Church became established; not so distinctly circumscribed in its outward form as was that of the Scriptures, but yet defined in that vast and rich store of writings of the early Fathers of the Church which providentially have been preserved to us. Not that the Fathers themselves lay down the doctrine, or prescribe discipline as of their own authority; rather they represent the consensus, and so the authority of the Church in her confessions of Faith, and in the acts of her Councils.

In any consideration, then, of the questions which trouble us now, it cannot but be advisable to go back to first principles; and these are, that there is a canon of godly writings, and a canon of godly doctrine and practice, both having, by Divine providence, their origin in the agency of that corporate body called the Church, which was itself instituted by, and in due order succeeded to, the Apostles, whom Christ sent as the Father had sent Him.

This corporate body appears to have acted throughout (and we must presume under Divine guidance, for it is inconceivable that God would leave His word and His Church to human agency without that) by means of Councils; and though we find that Emperors and Kings were present at such Councils, it is clear that the Council did all that was done, and not the sovereign power. And with this principle established, it follows that no sovereign power, either as represented by what we call the Crown, or by what we include under the word State—that is, through the Privy Council, the Parliament, or the Law Courts—can change those laws. And it further follows, that if the right of such external powers be once admitted, it cannot be stopped at the canon of doctrine and disciple, but must be allowed to extend to the canon of Scripture also. In other words, those who contend that we are dependent for our Church laws upon Parliament, or upon any other secular authority which may for the time being be paramount, must also admit that we are dependent for God's word upon Parliament, and that Parliament has the authority to suppress, change, or add to any verse, chapter, or book, in any part of the Bible.

But while the canon of the Church depended for its origin and its sustentation on the great Councils of the Church, the same name was given to decrees and decisions of provincial synods, and the like; and thus we find throughout the Middle Ages there were promulgated many series of canons, issued under ecclesiastical authority, but reflecting in detail the greater canon of the Church. The canons known as those of Abp. Theodore were promulgated at the national synod of Hertford as early as A.D. 673, and the series continue in this country, seldom with more than a few years' intermission, till 1603, when the Convocation, as representing the provincial synods, authoritatively set forth those which may be considered the last of the series.

On these canons, which appear under various names, but which, like the canons of the Church, are the decisions of authorised councils, synods, Convocations, and the like, canon law is mainly based, and is still dependent for its interpretation.

It is to this canon law that the clergy are amenable, and hence their name *canonici*, though it must be admitted that the name seems to have been first of all applied to members who were subject to the canons, or rules, of great religious communities, such as the Order of the Benedictines, or to collegiate foundations, such as we have still in our Cathedrals. Practically, however, the case may be summed up that where there was a canon, the members subject to the same were called *canonici*, but when the term was applied to the whole of the clergy, it was so because they were subject to the canons of the Church. And for the same reason that they were called *canonici*, so their obedience in matters of doctrine and discipline to the canons has been called (though the term is not of much authority) *canonical obedience*, to distinguish it from the obedience in secular matters which every citizen, whether cleric or lay, owes to the civil laws of the country.

And here I have apparently to quit for the moment the thread of my argument, and speak of what I believe to be a common meaning attached to this term—namely, obedience simply to the Bishop.

In the ordinary course of things it must be so. The Bishop is the officer whose duty it is to administer the canon law, and hence obedience to the canon law becomes obedience to the Bishop. But this need not always be so, and the strong passages which are usually quoted from the earlier writings of the Fathers, and more especially from the letters of St. Ignatius, to show that an absolute obedience is the rule, do not bear, when joined to their context, the meaning which is put upon them. There are some ten or twelve passages in which obedience is insisted on; but in all cases, the presbytery is associated with the Bishop. "It becomes you to concur in obedience to the will of your Bishop," he writes, "for your renowned presbytery is so framed together with the Bishop as are the strings with the harp; whereupon in unison of mind, and in harmony of love, Jesus Christ is sung." And again, "I exhort you that ye study to do all things in unity of thought with God; with your Bishop presiding in the place of God, and with your presbyters in the place of the synod of the Apostles." And while throughout the writings of this and other Fathers of the Church the greatest respect and deference is insisted on as due to the office of a Bishop, there is a clear distinction drawn between this and the deference due to his judgment apart from his synod.

No doubt examples can be found, both in writings and in practice, in which the authority of a Bishop is magnified. Indeed, the history of the struggle in the fifteenth century with respect to the authority of the Bishop of Rome turns upon this question. For in the Council of Constance, in 1415, it was decreed, after much debate, "That this synod has lawfully assembled in the name of the Holy Spirit, and representing the universal Church Militant, it has its authority directly from Christ, to which every one of whatever state or dignity he be, even be he that of Pope, is bound to be obedient." This clause was re-enacted at Basle, but eventually became disregarded, and it has ended, as our own generation has seen, in the infallibility of the Pope being enunciated as a dogma of faith; this being one of the most marked departures from the ancient canon into which the Church of Rome has drifted, since her expulsion from her Councils, through her tyranny, of a large portion of the Catholic Church. For the Council of the Church has been part of the internal economy of the

Church from the beginning, and the placing of a supreme power in the hands of an individual instead of the Council is calculated to produce schism, not unity; and as no canon was ever promulgated, or could be so according to the constitutional principle of the Church, obedience to a judgment irrespective of a properly-constituted Council, can in no wise be called canonical obedience.

But the question in our days is complicated by the following considerations. Firstly, the manifest encroachments by the Crown upon the liberties of the Church, and the manifest disregard of the rights and privileges of the Church of England in the debates in Parliament and in the general action of the Legislature. Such open attacks upon her material welfare, as legislation with respect to church-rates, churchyards, and the like, are less dangerous, because more open and noticed, than that subtle and secret encroachment which has been permitted to go forward upon her spiritual authority. The practical abolition of her Spiritual Courts by recent legislation, "here a little and there a little," is an example. And under the name of a Court of Appeal the functions of a synod have been exercised, not to say usurped; and so on questions of doctrine and discipline, questions touching the most vital truths of Christianity, judgments will have been incorporated, if the clergy yield obedience to them, into the canon law, subversive of the laws made by the duly-constituted authority in the Church.

How, then, does a priest stand with respect to his canonical obedience? I take two instances haphazard; he turns to his canon, as regards his judges (No. 127), and finds that "no man shall be admitted . . . to exercise any ecclesiastical jurisdiction . . . except he shall take a certain oath and subscribe certain articles . . . in the presence of the Archbishop or Bishop, and in open court, . . . or upon refusal to do so shall be suspended from the execution of his office until he take the oath and subscribe." He has been told publicly by the two Archbishops that the official, who has exercised far more ecclesiastical jurisdiction during the last few years than any man living, has refused to take the oath or to subscribe, on the ground that he is subject to Parliament and not to the canon. I ask, is submission to that judge canonical obedience? Surely not, but the reverse. Again he turns to his canon (No. 14), and finds that "all ministers shall observe the orders, rites, and ceremonies, prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer (the administration of the Sacraments being specially named), without either diminution . . . . in any respect, or adding anything in the matter or form thereof." He is, on the other hand, told by the civil power that he must read into the Prayer-Book some other document, which in effect diminishes materially from the order of that book. Is obedience to an order which is subversive of the canon to be called canonical obedience?

I am aware of the subtle retort that the rules in the Prayer-Book are not canon law, but statute law. But this is true only to the letter, not to the spirit, so far as the matter in question is concerned. The Prayer-Book was the work of the Convocation of both Provinces in 1661, and had their full authority, and therefore had all the authority of canon law. By the circumstance of the Crown and Parliament adopting that book, and incoporating it into the statute, they do not divest it of the force of canon law, they only add to it the force of statute law.

But the difficulties of canonical obedience do not end here. If it were so, the questions at issue being rendered clear, there would be more hope of their settlement. Unfortunately, however, for the present difficulties, the Bishops—whether wisely or unwisely I do not for one moment take upom myself to judge—have counselled in the name of obedience to the law a submission to the State usurpation of the rights and liberties of the Church. I say it with regret, but I must say it, as it is necessary to my argument, that I look in vain in most episcopal utterances for a recognition of the liberties of the Church in regard to her canons, and frequently find instead their use of the word "law" to mean, when analysed, the acknowledgment of an uncanonical judge, or the decree of the Privy Council (subversive of the plain meaning of the words of the Prayer-Book).

It appears to me not unreasonable, under such circumstances, that those who show in very many matters a far readier obedience to the Bishop and the canons than perhaps the Church of England has ever seen since the Reformation, but who, out of deference to the canon in one matter disobey the Bishop, should be acquitted of the charge of canonical disobedience. For the Bishop does not ask them to obey the canon of the Church, but the law of the State, and this is not in his province to ask. Further, he is not infallible, and his council has not aided him.

But there is an argument to which I must allude, because it has been used freely, namely, that the Bishop being set over the priest, the latter is relieved of responsibility in his action, if obedient to the Bishop. I would venture to suggest that vicarious responsibility is a plea which should be very carefully considered before advancing it. When a man's conscience is fully convinced that of two paths one is right, the other wrong, the word of another should, even though that other be a Bishop, not be lightly taken. The plea has served as an excuse from the fatal day in the Garden of Eden onwards.

Hence it is that canonical obedience has become a very complex matter, and if I were to enter on the question of the Courts wherein the Bishop can enforce obedience to the canons, I should show it was still more complex theoretically than I have represented it. It is true that ecclesiastical jurisdiction has been brought into abeyance by the encroachments of the State, but there is a wide gulf between the Bishop finding it difficult to enforce obedience in the Courts which exist, and his handing over his authority to the State, or accepting the judge-made law of a few members of the Committee of the Privy Council as a canon of the Church. The fact is, the Church has been permitted, in a godless age, to have her rights and privileges invaded. Her canon law has been put at the mercy of the State, which has in many ways shown hostility to her, and her efficiency has in consequence been much impaired. Waking up to her position, to her dignity, and to her historical reality, her sons in this generation have to meet the evils bequeathed by a previous one, and in boldly asserting the great principle of her Apostolic foundation, they are not frightened at the apparent subjection of her authority to human powers, or led away by such appearance to forget her Divine origin. Viewing the Church as a trust, they boldly insist upon the recognition not only of her canon, but of the principles of her canon.

They boldly assert that canon to be as vital as is the canon of Scripture; for they feel that in yielding the one canon they endanger the other, just as when there are two fortresses, the yielding of one to the enemy gives a vantage-ground to him from which to assault the other. They have borne patiently the opposition, the hard words, the cruel jests (of which there have been more than one notable instance), and, finally, out of respect for one canon, they have borne prosecution and imprisonment promoted and effected by an impetuous and angry section within the Church, who profess a respect for the other canon only.

The battle is nominally one of Courts and decisions of Courts on matters of ritual. It is really a struggle for the independence of the Church of England, without which she cannot exercise her rightful influence, and for the assertion of her Divine origin, without which she has no more claim for authority than the most recent philosophy propagated. And when the canon of the Church is on one side, and the State on the other, canonical obedience presents a hard task. But I venture to think when the battle of this generation is recorded in the pages of history, four names will appear in the front rank on the side of the canon —God only knowns if there will be more—the names of Tooth, Dale, Enraght, and Sidney Faithhorn Green.

Bishop **COURTNEY** said the question as it seemed to him was not what were the defects of our present Courts, however great they might be, nor the defects of our ecclesiastical law, but what was to be done? What should be their law in future Courts? What was to be the idea of the Courts by which better discipline was to be secured? They could not say that the meeting was unpractical after having heard from the Chairman that at least in one Colonial diocese there was an efficient Clergy Discipline Bill. He (the speaker) had asked permission to speak in order to say the same thing of the diocese of Jamaica, of which he had charge for nearly twenty-three years. They had a Diocesan Court, which if it did not work thoroughly well was passed sixteen years ago, and they were hardly able to say what its faults might be. If it failed, there had been few cases to test its faults, and he could not see where any alterations could be made for the better. In another colony—British Guiana—the Bishop requested his diocesans to report on a plan for a clergy discipline Bill, and they reported in favour of this Bill. He did not mean to say that in a country like England the supple machinery would be effective, but the Bill enabled the Bishop to deal with the clerical offenders; but in cases where the offence was not a matter of doctrine laymen could sit on the Courts with this exception, if he thought his plan would meet the views of the speakers and probably of the hearers.

The discussion was continued by the Rev. Dr. Wirgman, of South Africa, the Rev. Dr. Belcher, the Rev. R. Kenyon, the Rev. T. O. Marshall, the Rev. J. Cowden Clarke, and Canon Lefroy.

The proceedings were terminated by the Benediction.

[*Continued on p.* 627.]

CHURCH OF ENGLAND FUNERAL AND MOURNING REFORM ASSOCIATION.

This Society held its fourth annual meeting on Monday afternoon in the Guildhall, Derby, Alderman Bemrose in the Chair. The Rev. F. Laurence, hon. secretary, stated that at the meeting at Grosvenor House in London in June, presided over by the Duke of Westminster, well-known undertakers had expressed a desire to co-operate with the society, and that he believed a friendly feeling to exist throughout the country on behalf of undertakers generally. The Ven. Archdeacon Emery, Permanent Secretary of the Church Congress, said that the Society encouraged only such observances as gave prominence to the Christian principles of faith, hope, and love, and discouraged feasting and treating, the use of crape, plumes, scarves, as also of metal coffins, brick graves, and other things which unduly retard the return of the body to the earth. It would yet have every effort made to mark the solemnity of the occasion, and suggested the uniform adoption of dark attire and the assembling of friends at church instead of at the house of mourning. The Archdeacon added, that among very many who had given their general approval of the objects of the Society were the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, the Archbishop of York, the Dukes of Westminster, Sutherland, Wellington, and Buckingham, the Duchess of Sutherland, the Marquises of Abergavenny, Ailesbury, and Lansdowne, the Marchionesses of Abergavenny, Camden, and Ripon, the Earls of Aberdeen, Cathcart, Carnarvon, Dartmouth, Derby, Grosvenor, Mulgrave, Lichfield, Jersey, Wharncliffe, Romney, Manvers, and Zetland, Earl Cairns, Earl Fitzwilliam, Earl Nelson, Earl Darnley, the Countesses of Cathcart, Derby, Brownlow, Hopetoun, Grosvenor, Scarborough, Sefton, Wharncliffe, and Zetland, and Viscounts Cranbrook and Hardinge.

The Rev. H. C. Shuttleworth, St. Paul's, and others addressed the meeting; the Deans of Manchester, Westminster, and York, Archdeacons Blunt, Emery, and Hay, and others were elected Council for the ensuing year.

HOME REUNION SOCIETY.

A new departure in the interests of Home Reunion was attempted at the Church Congress this year, and carried out with a considerable measure of success. The Vicar of St. Werburgh kindly placed his church at the disposal of the Society for a special service, mainly intended for Nonconformists. It took place at 7.30 p.m. on Wednesday, October 4, and the ground floor of the church was three parts full of persons, who, for the most part, were evidently unaccustomed to attend church. The service was conducted by the Vicar, and the Rev. Canon Medd, Rector of North Cerney, near Cirencester. The service began with the hymn, "O Lord, how joyful 'tis to see." There was no choir, but the organ was played by the senior curate, the Rev. J. W. Kewley. Canon Medd then read from the pulpit the seventeenth chapter of St. John. This was followed by another hymn, "O Holy Spirit, Lord of Grace." Then he said three collects and the "Our Father," in which—as well as in the hymns—the congregation joined heartily. Next followed the sermon, which was the chief feature, lasting about three-quarters of an hour.

Canon **MEDD** took these two passages in the place of a short text: Psalm cxxxiii., Eph. iv. 1—6. He said he represented the "Home Reunion Society," whose special object was:—

> The purpose of this Society shall be to present the Church of England in a conciliatory attitude towards those who regard themselves as outside her pale, so as to lead towards the corporate reunion of all Christians holding the doctrines of the Ever-Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation and Atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Society, though it cannot support any scheme of comprehension compromising the three Creeds, or the Episcopal Constitution of the Church, will be prepared to advocate all reasonable liberty in matters not contravening the Church's Faith, Order, or Discipline.

While union amongst Christians at large was of the first necessity, there was a special obligation imposed on members of the Church of England to promote reunion at home—*i.e.*, amongst all English-speaking Christians, for he would include our brethren across the Atlantic and throughout the world. This for two reasons:—1. That full advantage might be taken of the marvellous, and evidently providential opportunity, for the spread of the Gospel now offered —and especially to England—by the hold acquired by the English-speaking race over so large a portion of the habitable globe. Against this one fearful hindrance arose from "our unhappy divisions," which placed so serious a stumbling-block in the way of the acceptance of the Gospel by the Heathen. And 2, that the spread of unbelief and irreligion might be more effectually checked among our neglected masses at home. Surely among reflecting Christians there could be no doubt either of the grandeur of the present opportunity, of the grave responsibility it laid on Christians of this generation, or of the awful hindrance, the awful waste of spiritual force, the untold practical weakness entailed by disunion in a great work, which, with the arrears which have to be overtaken, would seem almost beyond the united strength of all. Surely it must be evident to any attentive reader of that perhaps the most solemn chapter of the whole Bible, the seventeenth of St. John, that one prominent subject in the Lord's great prayer, alike for those there around Him, and for all future generations of those who "should believe on Him through their need," was, that "they might be *One*" —and that with a *visible* unity; for it was like a unity which the outer world should see and acknowledge as a proof "that the Father had sent Him." The same idea lay in the very conception of the Church, the great body of baptised believers, as presented in the New Testament. In our Lord's own teaching it was presented as a Kingdom. The Gospel he preached was "the Gospel of the Kingdom." In that idea as in that of a "body"— the "Body of Christ"—both unity and visibility were included. And a love of the Church, as God's family, a feeling of spiritual loyalty and patriotism towards our Zion, our Jerusalem, our City of God, had always been a marked characteristic of God's great saints under both covenants. These considerations ought to create in us a deeper sense of the duty of a conciliatory, a really brotherly spirit towards all "who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity"—of speaking the truth indeed, but speaking it always "in love"—of aiming at a deeper holiness and devotion and consecration in life, a living nearer to our blessed Lord, for the nearer we were to Him the nearer we should be to each other; and, lastly, of praying more and more fervently, in church and at home, for the recovery of unity, inward and outward, among all Christians.

The service concluded with "The Church's One Foundation," a Collect for Unity, and the Benediction.

CHURCH AND STATE IN FRANCE.

The Church and State question in France is rapidly assuming a serious character. The relationship of the Church and State in France is altogether different from that which exists in England, both as regards the nature of the property enjoyed by the Church, and the superintendence exercised by the State over its spiritual concerns. In England the Bishops and clergy are supported by land and tithes which have been voluntarily given for the benefit of the Church. In France the Bishops and clergy are paid by a State grant, amounting annually to about £1,800,000, which is increased by supplemental grants provided by the Department and Municipal Councils, which probably amounts to about £400,000 more, making £2,200,000 in all. The French clergy are thus paid directly from the taxes, in the same way as the Army and Navy, or any other Department of the State. In England, on the other hand, the Church never figures in the Budgets of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. No annual Parliamentary grant is made to her by the State. Her Bishops and clergy are not paid out of the taxes. Her income is derived from sources, many of which were open to her before the Norman Conquest. In France, on the other hand, the existing relationship between Church and State is dependent on the conditions of a Concordat which was dictated by Napoleon Bonaparte in 1801, for the purpose of keeping the Church in subjection to the State. This Concordat forbade the Bishops leaving their dioceses without permission from the Minister of Public Worship, interdicted their correspondence directly with Rome, and required them not to issue pastoral letters and *mandements* to their clergy and people without having previously submitted copies of them to the Government. In the course of the last eighty years most of these trammels have been shaken off by the Church, and, although they still exist in the Concordat, successive Governments have connived at their being quietly ignored. The anti-religious party, however, that now has the ascendency in France, is no longer content that this state of things should continue. The Republican party is in no mood for making any such wise allowances as these, because, says a contemporary, "they want a stick with which to beat the Church, and to some of them it seems that the Concordat is exactly the stick they are looking for." Accordingly, during the last four months a Parliamentary Commission has been engaged in making a general inquiry into the working of the Concordat, and the Commissioners have lately reported that its enactments are being continually infringed, and the report, as a whole, has evidently been drawn up with the view of showing that the Church and the Republic cannot live harmoniously together. When we remember the antagonism to all religion that prevails in certain classes of French society, we cannot be surprised that such a report as this should be violently opposed to any public recognition of national Christianity by the State. The anti-Church party forget that the French peasantry, as a body, have not yet become scoffers like themselves, and that if such legislation as they favour were carried, and caused a number of village churches to be closed, the result might, at no distant day, bring an overwhelming majority of reactionary members into the Chamber of Deputies. It is an easy, and with many a favourite task, to denounce the Church; but its power is still enormous, and it exercises an unlimited sway over the minds of millions of Frenchmen. To incur its implacable resentment is, therefore, to provoke a most serious peril; and even the most ardent spirits amongst the advanced Republicans hesitate before finally adopting a policy which may bring about a crisis which it is pre-eminently their interest to avoid.—*The National Church.*

THE VEIL UPLIFTED.

That the forces of the Cosmopolitan Revolution have long been at work in Ireland is a fact upon which we have repeatedly insisted. The International Society has been as active there as in other countries, using everywhere the same methods for the same great end. The following account of a recent trial illustrates, in a striking and instructive manner, the inner life of the secret organisations, acting, as we have the best authority for believing, under the immediate orders of the infamous Land League, and indeed subsidised out of its funds:—

"A magisterial inquiry was held last Saturday at Armagh, respecting ten persons charged with treason-felony, and with being members of a society established for the purpose of committing murder and other crimes. Dr. Boyd prosecuted on behalf of the Crown. In opening the case, he said that formerly there had existed in Ireland, and particularly in some districts in Armagh, a society known as the Ribbon Society. Some time ago the societies had been amalgamated by a man named Burns, from America, who had given them the title of the Irish Patriotic Brotherhood. The object of the association was to assassinate all loyal subjects, especially landlords, agents, stipendiary magistrates, and policemen. The records of the society were kept in books, and one of these books, kept by one of the accused, Michael Waters, had been found in a house from which he had been evicted. It appeared that whenever any outrage was assigned to any member of the society a meeting was called, and money was subscribed to compensate him for carrying out the deed. There were many persons still at large, who would be proceeded against, and there was ample evidence against them. The posting of letters had been traced to the society. The first witness called was a sheriff's officer and blacksmith named Patrick Duffy, who deposed that he was a member of the society for two years. He attended several meetings at the Cloghan National School, the master of which administered the oath. Three of the prisoners were officers. At a meeting of the society held in June, 1881, the chairman stated that Mr. Brooks, of Castleblayney, who was agent over him, had served a lot of ejectments, and it was time to stop his career and to get rid of him. Several members were selected and they took an oath to murder Brooks, and they were warned that if they got a chance of doing so and failed they would be called upon to show why they had not done so. Two of the prisoners, whom witness identified, were amongst the number who took the oath to murder Mr. Brooks. On the 24th of July witness was directed to go and meet some men, one of them being the prisoner Geoghan. These men were two of the men sworn to murder Mr. Brooks. Witness was to get a blunderbuss for one of them, and he was to go with them to a field to wait for Mr. Brooks coming home. They were told that he had gone up that way, and was likely to return across the field, where they were to wait for him. As it happened, however, he went home another way. They lay in wait for him from half-past three till half-past five or six o'clock. The word was brought by one of the prisoners, whom witness identified, that Brooks had gone home another way. Witness also deposed that he was present when the prisoner, John Donnelly, was paid £7 for having burned a mill belonging to a Mr. John M'Cullagh. Soon after Christmas a meeting had been called for the purpose of deciding on the question, and the money was subscribed by those present, and Donnelly was told off to do the work. After the mill was burned Donnelly left the country, but subsequently returned. One of the prisoners, who acted as secretary, kept a record of the proceedings in printing letters traced with a pen. This was done to prevent his handwriting being identified. While the witness was giving evidence, a man in court came up to him and whispered in his ear. This man was at once arrested, and committed for seven days for contempt. The inquiry was then adjourned until Monday."

A plot among the convicts at Dartmoor to make a general escape is reported. A discovery has been made of skeleton keys constructed out of the bones which the convicts have found in their meat at meal times. Two convicts were recently found in a closet, after having unlocked and escaped from their cells, their evident intention being to secrete themselves there until the opportunity presented itself for getting away. It is believed that many of the convicts have possessed themselves of these bone keys, and it is even stated that not long ago a convict actually made an offer to one of the officers to unlock any door in the prison, while another is said to have informed the authorities that a general plan had been formed for breaking out of the prison. It was intended to make keys of bones, to unlock the cells in one of the prisons, seize the warder in charge at night, and when the night watchman, who carries a pistol and some of the keys, went his rounds, to overpower him and throw open the other prisons.

Printed and Published by THOMAS DIXON, at the Office, No. 6, Whitefriars-street, Fleet-street.—Saturday, October 7, 1882.